

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01494296 5









DOMESDAY AND FEUDAL  
STATISTICS.



# DOMESDAY AND FEUDAL STATISTICS

WITH A CHAPTER ON  
AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

BY  
A. H. INMAN.

*Sunt geminæ Somni portæ quarum altera fertur  
Cornea quâ veris facilis datur exitus umbris  
Alterâ candenti perfecta nitens elephanto  
Sed falsa ad cælum mittunt insomnia manes*  
VERG.

50663  
28/8/01

London :  
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW. E.C.  
1900.

[ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

DA  
190  
D7ISS

# OF THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH

By A. H. INMAN.

(*In preparation*)

ALTHOUGH early and external notices of the *Angles*, *Danes*, *Jutes*, *Northmen*, and *Saxons* have not generally been esteemed worthy of inclusion in the National collection known as the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, there may possibly be some reason to suppose that such are not entirely unconnected with the subject of English History, and even that a not inconsiderable portion of the present inhabitants of Great Britain have actually derived from the races aforesaid.

The period of the Roman occupation is traversed at large in the *Corpus Historicum* of this country named above, with a few incidental notices of some of the Germanic races, *still* believed to have subsequently become a material element therein: the earlier history of these is by no means to be discovered by references limited to the terms *Britain* or *Briton*, any more than that of the *Franks* would have been by a like restriction to the word *Gaul*.

So great is the obscurity of the period, that the mere fact of a settlement of *England* by the *English*, has been not unquestioned: exhaustive notices (desirable enough) of the divers races from *Germania* in this island, would necessitate very considerable research, nor are such intended; nevertheless, a small collection (for the more part in English), chronologically and systematically arranged, may serve, not only to confirm the ancient evidences of the acquist of this country (and in illustration of the character of the Saxons) but also—if the subject be deemed of sufficient import—as a basis for future investigations.

---

## A HISTORY OF NORTHUMBRIA

By A. H. INMAN.

(*In preparation*)

## PREFACE.

THE Analysis of Domesday set forth in some six Tables in this volume rests on the computations of Sir H. Ellis, and Messrs. F. Maitland and C. Pearson, the first of which is *generally* reliable, and practically accords with that of an independent authority (Sharon Turner).

Most essential service has recently been rendered by Professor Maitland, whose calculations of certain factors have made advance in the knowledge of our ancient Record practicable : it is not easy to overestimate the debt due to the labour of this author, but it must also be borne in mind that a computation of *Hides* and *Carucates* is a matter of much difficulty. The method used has been remarked in these pages in a note, but direct reference should be made to the computer's own remarks in *Domesday Book and Beyond* ; although there are theories in that volume scarcely compatible with the witness of the "Survey," and

other evidences, it is nevertheless full of interest, and should be possessed by all who have an interest in England's greatest *record*.

There is no reason to challenge the figures obtained from the *History of England during the Middle and Early Ages*, and it is believed that the Analysis of the several additions of the three above-named writers, yield *generally* correct information; there are also in this volume independent computations from Domesday and other sources, which claim *practical* rather than *minute* accuracy.

With regard to the Statistics of Feudal Tenures, it may be observed that the Baronial Charters of 1166 are incomplete, that the deficiencies can to some extent be supplied from the *Pipe Roll* of 1167-8, and that further additions (given separately), are available from other sources: these returns are corroborated by those of the *Pipe Roll* of 1253-4, and the *Enrolled Accounts of the Exchequer* for the Inquisitions of 1346-7 (as computed by a mediæval and contemporary scribe), so that the correctness of the *general* result is a matter scarcely to be affected by criticism, save of the records themselves. This, of course, is to be understood rather of the plain facts elicited, than of any deductions from them containing elements

of estimation ; the latter, to a certain extent, are inevitable in the earliest (1166-8) case, and the method, acceptable or otherwise, is set forth, but as a *modus*, necessitated by the defect of contemporary evidences.

A considerable amount of space is allotted to tabular illustration, and, it is believed, that the mere *arithmetical* results are free from conspicuous errors, although no attempt has been made to *exactly* determine long series of fractions ; nor can pages, so largely concerned with mere figures, attempt to compete in interest, for the *general* reader, with *theories*, elaborated by verbal art, and displayed in becoming detail.

A Statistical Index, before the *text* (the former perhaps also of service in demonstrating any too condensed details of latter), recapitulates and classifies some of the more important *data*, but rarely repeats those given only in the Tables, a list of which (arranged) precedes it : both, of course, are for convenience of reference, *etc.*, and the former, owing to necessary brevity, does not always *quite* convey the sense, more precisely given in the pages alluded to.

Some sort of apology may be esteemed necessary in the presentation of pages mainly concerned

with prosaic details ; the reply must be, that in any acknowledged science, *speculations*, and other the usual *impedimenta* of *extraordinary* genius should be put to the *ordinary* tests of *observation* and *experiment*, and that there are no (or scarcely any) practical systems of knowledge, where so many *theories*, alike unproved and improbable, are permitted to survive, thrive, and increase, as in the accepted School of History. The *practical* Sciences have formulated their systems, *not* without labour, and by careful examinations and comparisons ; the modern historian, it is true, has dismissed the wonders, signs, and portents of the mediæval world, but taking into consideration the usages and relative opportunities of the different ages, he often displays so vast an inexperience of the ordinary *phenomena* of the physical world, as to convict himself of a *credulity* much less excusable than that of an *antecessor*, whom it is his frequent pleasure to decry.

It may be permitted to notice some of the novelties in these pages : for example, it appears that the number of *Liberi Homines* and *Sochemanni* in Lincoln, and Norfolk (presumably also Suffolk), have been greatly overestimated, the figures in Domesday giving no direct clue as to



the actual number of those classes ; again it seems to amount to a matter of demonstration that the *Carucates* of Norfolk (supposedly also Suffolk), were usually neither Fiscal Units nor Teamlands.

A theory is current that the total "Service" of the Military Fees of England was equivalent to the number of *Milites* due from the feudal tenants *in exercitu* ; such a doctrine has nothing *a priori* in its favor, save facility of computation, nor has it (so far as I am aware), any *general* support from records, but very much the reverse.

There is, of course, no attempt here to develop the History of the Feudal System in England ; the publication of some recent volumes of the *Rolls Series* allowed their editor the opportunity of *suggesting* (and little *more*), at considerable length, certain views, scarcely probable in themselves, and which could not have been put forward at all, had a few elementary *data*, concerning the military tenures of this country, been available for general reference.

The view that *one* plough could, and did, *till* annually 120 acres of arable land, has been long established, and is, of course, completely at variance with any known practice of Agriculture in this country ; as theories of this Art are usually

held with a tenacity justly proportioned to their propounder's inexperience of the details of husbandry, it is scarcely probable that the *numerous* examples drawn from English *records* in these pages, can *possibly* diminish the confidence of those who *allege* historical evidences in support of what passes for Scholarship—to any actually acquainted with the practice of Agriculture, the appeal to records (which uphold such) is entirely superfluous.

The curiosities of Domesday can very well be studied in Sir H. Ellis' *General Introduction* and *Index of Matters* (Vol. III), nevertheless in writing on our ancient Record, it has (contrary to the practice of many of its exponents), been esteemed necessary to traverse it, entry by entry, for certain matters exemplified in this volume. This remark applies but partially to *Little Domesday*, whose *technical* manorial details have been almost unperused (valuable as they may be for the three counties therein contained), nor is there the least pretension towards exhausting—in any way—the contents of that unrivalled witness of Anglo-Saxon customs.

In conclusion, it should be stated that Mr. N. J. Hone, of Surbiton, is responsible for the evi-

dence from unprinted materials in Chapter II, having made professional searches (to instructions, in particular records), on divers matters ; references to these are given in their place, so that they can easily be tested for *general* accuracy ; this the writer (who is responsible for the remaining extracts, etc., from records and works of authority) does not doubt.

*Wardrew House,  
Gilsland,  
Oct. 22, 1900.*



NOTE TO PP. 133 TO 135.

The writer believes the *tables, etc.* (signed F. Baring, *vide* pp. 133 to 135, and p. 288, *English Historical Review*, 1897), are entirely *bonâ fide*, and therefore takes this and other opportunities of modifying his remarks thereanent, having since heard that the author of the *E. H. R.* article has different views on the population of 1086, to those frequently held.

It should be understood that this writer dissents from the opinions and statistics in the *E. H. R.* as much as ever, nor does he allow their method to be a correct one—this the reader (if interested in the matter) should form his own judgment upon by reference to them, and the originals they cite—what is here stated is that (however near or far from the actual facts, which of course can never at this day be completely recovered) they are the *genuine* persuasions of the above-mentioned author (and doubtless others), which explanation the writer of *D. and F. S.* thinks proper to make, and *entirely* of his mere motion, as a *servitium debitum* to the author cited at the head of this note.—*A. H. I.*

\*\*

\*\* These remarks are partially cancelled ; see note, p. xi.



# EPITOME.

## DOMESDAY STATISTICS.

### CHAPTER I (pp. 1—24).

Population and Counties, p. 1. Main Statistical Table, p. 5. Population 1086 and 1377, p. 5. Units of Assessment and Measures, p. 5. Plough Team, p. 6. Comparative Values of Implements and Oxen, p. 6. Ploughland, p. 7. Area *not* tilled by one plough, p. 7. *Oxford Arithmetic*, p. 8. *College Farming*, p. 9. *Valets* and *Valuits*, p. 10. *Villani*, p. 10. *Opera*, p. 10. *Bordars* and *Cottars*, p. 11. Illustrations of same from *D. B.*, p. 11. *Servi*, p. 12. *Sokemen*, p. 12. Popular estimate of *Liberi Homines*, and *Sokemen* (1086) not in accord with *D. B.* evidence, p. 12. *Liberi homines*, p. 12. *Radknights*, p. 13. *Tenants in chief*, p. 13. *Coliberti* and *Buri*, p. 13. *Geburi* not *Coliberti*, p. 13. *Geburi* as *Villani*, p. 16. Other Classes, p. 16. *Porcarii* and *Bovarii*, p. 16. Remarks on Comparative Table I, p. 17. Land to one team, p. 17. Land of one team in demesne, and in villeinage, p. 18. Oxen per plough in Wales, *t. Hen.* II, p. 18. Teams of less than 8 oxen, p. 22. Teams of 8 oxen, p. 22. Rotations, p. 23. Method of Tables, p. 23. Population varies as Teams, p. 24. Slender results from other *unlike* Factors, p. 24.

## FEUDAL STATISTICS.

### CHAPTER II (pp. 25—109d).

Anglo-Saxon Charters, p. 26. Norman Charters, p. 26. Heptarchic Hides, p. 28. 120 statute acres arable *not* the land of one family, p. 29. Owners of land T.R.E. and T.R.W., p. 30. Modern theories of ancient landownership

*impracticable*, p. 31. Places, Manors, Vills, and Parishes 1086-1377, p. 31. The Hide and Hidage, p. 32. Carucage, p. 33. Mediæval Taxes, p. 33. Danegeld, etc., p. 34. Sheriff's Aid, p. 34. Occasional stability of Hides, p. 35. Examples of continuity of Hidage, p. 36. Variations of Areal Hides, p. 37. Domesday "Measures," p. 38. Cornish "Acres," p. 38. Intermixture of *D. B.* "Measures," p. 39. Fiscal Hides in Woods and Marshes, p. 40. Yorkshire Manors, p. 41. Scope of the Fiscal Hide, p. 41. Knights' Fees, p. 42. Bishop of Durham's case, *Service*, and Retainers, p. 42. Average Fee, p. 43. Variations very considerable, p. 44. Examples, p. 44. Baronial Charters, 1166, p. 46. *Dominicum*, p. 46. Retrospective references of early enfeoffments, p. 47. Their authority, p. 48. Nigel d'Aubignie and Roger de Moubrai, p. 49. Aids of 14 Hen. II and 38 Hen. III contrasted, p. 51. Aid to marry King Edward's daughter, p. 52. Contemporary totaling of Knights' Fees, *t. Ed. III*, p. 53. *Moubrai* Fee, p. 53. Method of computing Knight's Fees of *t. Hen. II*, p. 53. Explanation of 5 Column Table, *t. Hen. II*, p. 54. Composition of known "service," p. 55. Composition of unknown "service," p. 55. Remarks on above, p. 55. Total capital tenants by Knight Service *t. Hen. II*, p. 56. *Render* the usual basis of subsequent returns, p. 56. Exceptional cases, p. 57. *Render*, and "Service," p. 57. New Feoffment, p. 58. Excess of old feoffment on Church Fees not usually paid, p. 58. Aid to marry, 19 Hen. III, and Gascony Scutage, 1242, p. 59. *Testa de Nevill*, p. 59. Northumberland Inquisitions, 26 Hen. III, p. 60. Evidence of *Testa de Nevill*, p. 60. Extent of alleged exactions of new feoffment, p. 61. Evidence of Pipe Roll, 14 Hen. II, p. 62. Summary of Church Fees, 1168, p. 62. Their *unrecognised* liabilities unpaid, and their extensive demesnes, p. 63. Liberty of Ripon, p. 64. Inadequacy of Column II, Table I, p. 64. Estimate of "Service," 1168, p. 64. Estimate of acres in Church and Lay Fees, p. 65. Estimate of Total Fees, p. 65. Average, Hides, and Acres *per* Lay Fee, p. 65. Characteristic examples, p. 66. *Super dominicum*, p. 67. Statistics of Fees, p. 67.



Number of Capital Tenants, contrasted with *D. B.*, p. 68. Inquisitions, *t. John*, p. 68. Later Inquisitions, p. 68. Inquisitions of 1346, p. 69. Returns of 4 Hen. IV, p. 69. Change of method—as usually only *demesne* fees answered in 1403, p. 70. Returns of 6 Hen. VI, p. 71. No Assessments on Knights' Fees *t. Hen. VII*, and *Jac. I*, p. 71. Further evidence from the *Testa de Nevill*, p. 71. Fines, *ne transfretant*, p. 74. Alleged development of the Fee from the Hide, p. 74. Remarks on same, p. 75. Records refute this theory, p. 75. *Scutagium* and *Auxilium*, p. 80. Early evidence defective, p. 82. Military service, p. 83. How performed by Peterboro' Abbey, p. 84. Prior of Coventry's case, p. 85. *Escuage* tenants, p. 86. *Disseisin*, p. 87. Obligations of under tenants, p. 88. Inadequacy of entries of Scutage in the Pipe Rolls, *t. Ed. I*, p. 88. Double meaning of Service illustrated by the Luterell case, p. 89. Examples from *Madox, etc.*, p. 90. Payment of Scutage, p. 92. Examples from MSS, mostly unprinted, p. 93. Decline of Scutage, and its extinction in the 17th century, p. 96. Popular theory of Service *in exercitu*, p. 97. Unanimity of *authorities* thereanent, p. 97. Quotas of Service, p. 97. Army of Calais (*Brady*), *A.D. 1346*, p. 98. Service of more than 100 *milites*, p. 99. Popular theory of Knight Service lacks support of Records, p. 99. Expenses of Military Service, p. 100. Bargains with hired Knights; actual case in 1284, between tenant and *miles*, p. 100. Wages of a Knight, *t. Hen. II*, p. 100. Flemish Conventions, *Hen. I-II*, p. 100a. Period of Service, p. 101. Prestations, p. 101. Army of Ireland, 1211, p. 101. 40 days, p. 102. Normandy Inquisitions, p. 102. *Milites* in *D. B.*, p. 102. *Auxilium* *t. Hen. I*, p. 103. Assize of Arms, *t. Hen. II*, p. 104. Alleged decay of Archery, p. 104. *Feudum Militis* in Normandy, 11th century, p. 104. *Milites* of Peterboro' Abbey, p. 105. Service of Evesham Abbey *in exercitu*, p. 105. The predecessor of Ranulf Flambard *disseised* for defect of service, *etc.*, p. 105. Diversity of services due, p. 106. Partial Analysis of Moreton Escheat, p. 107. Evidence of the *Roman de Rou*, p. 107. Fees held since the Acquest of England, p. 108. Early subinfeud-

dations of lay tenants, p. 108. Subinfeudation, *t.* Wm. I, p. 109. Duke Richard's military service, p. 109. A recent American work on the Feudal System, p. 109. A *magnum opus* on *Ancient Britain*, p. 109a. Extracts from, and design of *said* work, p. 109a. Formation of *A. S. Chronicles*, p. 109b. The *Annals of Northumbria*, p. 109c. *Chroniclers*, p. 109c. Introduction of Learning in the North, p. 109c. Royal Genealogies, p. 109c. *Gothic and Germanic*, p. 109c. Goths, *Gutæ*, *Gothones*, *Guthones*, and *Gothini*, p. 109d. *Dani*, *Suethans*, and *Suethidi*, not necessarily Gothic, p. 109d. *Angli* and *Suevi*; their location, p. 109d. *Regnar Loabrog* in English History, A.D. 870; his speech understood, p. 109d. Deficiency of the Collection of the *Mon. Hist. Brit.*, as to early evidences of the English races, p. 109d.

## AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS.

### CHAPTER III (pp. 109e—161).

*Tacitus' Germania*, p. 109e. *Angli* and *Suevi*, p. 109i. Early notices of Scandinavia, p. 109i. Scandinavian English, p. 109i. The *Angli* and *Suiones* of *Suevia*; *Dani*, *Dacians*, and *Gutæ*, p. 109j. *Brittia* and the *Varni* in the 6th century, p. 109j. Traditional kinship of Angles, Danes, Jutes, Northmen, Saxons, and *Suevi*, p. 109j. 120 fiscal Acres, p. 110. *Walter de Henley's* perpetual aration, p. 111. Welsh evidence, *t.* Hen. II, p. 111. Contrast of Agriculture, 1086, 1696, and 1897, p. 112. Average yield of wheat per acre: neither evidence, nor probability in placing it at 6 bushels, p. 116. *Agricultural data*, 1086, p. 117. Consumption of beer, p. 117. Consumption of bread stuffs, *etc.*, p. 118. Population of 1696 treble that of 1086, p. 118. *Terra dupliciter ad arandum*, p. 119. Meadow, 1086, p. 119. Poll Tax Returns of 1377 and 1379, p. 120. The Black Death, p. 121. Ploughs and Population, 1086, p. 121. Fallacy of figures in some counties, p. 122. Scheme of 1000 acres arable, 1086, p. 123. Norfolk Carucates *not* Teamlands, *nor* Hides *ad gheldum*, *ut* mainly areal estimates of arable land, p. 124. Proof

of above statement, p. 125. *Leugæ*, p. 126. Ripon Mile Crosses, p. 126. Liberty of Ripon, p. 126. How estimated in *D. B.*, p. 127. Yorkshire Manors, p. 128. Examples therefrom, p. 129. 64 acres to 1 team in *D. B.*, p. 130. Ely Manors, p. 130. Middlesex Villeins and their holdings, 1086, p. 131. Peterboro' Villeins and their teams, 1125-8, p. 131. Population varies as ploughs, p. 132. Collation of Peterboro' Manors, 1125-8, with *D. B.*, p. 133. Eccentric views of philosophers, p. 133. Examination of their methods, p. 134. Utility of same, p. 135. Manor of Alwalton, 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries, p. 135. Manor of Histon, 1086-1278, p. 137. Hundred Rolls, p. 138. Manor of Coatham, 1086-1279, p. 139. Genius of the Romantic School, p. 139. Fiscal Hides do not always denote Arable Land, p. 139. Marshland Hides, p. 140. Values of Arable, 1086, p. 140. Other Manorial Examples, p. 141. Bedfordshire Carucates, p. 141. Proof that demesne carucates were *not* usually tilled by *one* team, p. 142. Ramsey Manors, p. 143. Assistance of *Customary* tenants, p. 143. Lease of Hexham demesne, 1232, p. 144. Lease of *Le Blakelound*, 1292, p. 144. Manor of Harewood, 47 Hen. III, p. 144. Rochester Carucates, p. 145. Proportion of Teams in demesne, 1086, p. 145. Estimate of England, 1086, in the *Village Community*, p. 146. In some respects unreliable, p. 146. 8 oxen the standard Plough Team of Domesday, p. 146. Bordars often have plough oxen in *D. B.*, p. 147. Method of 9 Counties Table, p. 147. Illustrations of *Villani*, p. 148. Yorkshire Agriculture from the 1297 Subsidy Rolls, p. 149. Manor of Wilburton, p. 150. Its details refute college *theories* of Agriculture, p. 151. Great increase of ploughs in villeinage, p. 152. Rochester Manors, 1086, and *c. Ed. I*, p. 152. Plough services due therefrom, at latter period, p. 152. Agricultural details of the 12th and 13th centuries, p. 153. Demesne ploughmen's diverse duties, p. 155. Impracticability of current views of mediæval Agriculture, p. 156. Manor of Cuxham, p. 157. Manor of Cotum, p. 157. Manor of Quaringdon, p. 158. Manor of Adulfsnasa, p. 158. Rainfall, p. 158. Mediæval agricultural measures, p. 158.

FORTY-THREE TABLES  
CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.

<i>Dates.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Subject Matter.</i>	<i>Pages.</i>
<i>Heptarchy.</i>	A	Partial Hidage of Heptarchic England, ... ..	28
1065	B	Claro Wapentake, Yorks; Status of some A.S. landowners, ...	30
1065 to } 20 Ed. III }	C	Claro Wapentake, Yorks; Values 1065 and 1085; Service 31 Ed. I, and 20 Ed. III, ...	45
1086	D	Domesday Book; recorded Number, and Percentage of more important Classes, ... ..	2
"	E	Domesday Book; County Constitution Table, ... ..	3
"	F	Domesday Book; Main Statistical Table, ... ..	4
"	G	Domesday Book; Table of "Measures," ... ..	5
"	H	Domesday Book; Comparative Table I, ... ..	14—15
"	I	Domesday Book; Comparative Table II, ... ..	19
"	J	Domesday Book; Comparative Table III, ... ..	20—21
"	K	Domesday Book; Arable of England ( <i>F. Seebohm</i> ), ... ..	146
"	L	Domesday Book; Proportion of Lords' and Tenants' Teams (9 counties), ... ..	145
"	M	<i>Estimate of Constitution, and Population of Estate, with 1000 acres Arable, ... ..</i>	123
"	N	Domesday Book; Teams and Teamlands of Yorkshire Manors of given dimensions ( <i>Leugæ</i> ), ... ..	129
1086—1125	O	Domesday Book; collated with Inquest of some Peterboro' Manors, ... ..	133

FORTY-THREE TABLES CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED—*contd.*

Dates.	Ref. Nos.	Subject Matter.	Pages.
1086 to Hen. II	P	Domesday Book; Carucates in Fees of Earl Richmond and Baron Perci; also "Service," ... ..	44
1086—1279	Q	Domesday Book and Hundred Rolls; Manor of Histon, ...	137-8
1086 to c. Ed. I	R	Domesday Book; Demesne and Villeinage Teams in some Rochester Manors; also 1290—1320, ... ..	152
1086—Ed. 2	S	Domesday Book; Hidage of Ramsey Abbey Manors collated with returns of Ed. II,	36
1086—1897	T	Domesday Book; Teamlands and Crops (21 counties) estimated against 1897, ...	114
1125-8	U	Constitution of some Peterboro' Manors, and Acres tilled in same, <i>per</i> Villein Team (8 oxen), ... ..	132
Hen. I to Hen. VI	V	Records of Knight Service, ...	77
1166-8	W	Analysis of Ecclesiastical Fees,	62
"	X	Summary of "Service," ...	64
"	Y	" " Total Fees, ...	65
"	Z	Analysis of 51 cases of <i>known</i> "Service," ... ..	55
"	AA	Analysis of 76 cases of <i>unknown</i> "Service," ... ..	55
"	BB	Analysis of New Feoffment, ...	61
"	CC	General Examples Tabulated,...	66
"	DD	Exceptional Cases, ... ..	57
"	EE	Fees due, not charged, ... ..	61

FORTY-THREE TABLES CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED—*contd.*

<i>Dates.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos</i>	<i>Subject Matter.</i>	<i>Pages.</i>
1166—1346	FF	Knight Service ; 5 Tables <i>t. Hen. II, John, Hen. III, Ed. I, and Ed. III, ...</i>	50
<i>Hen. II to Ed. III</i> }	GG	Tabular Illustrations of Feudal Service, from <i>Madox, etc., ...</i>	90—92
<i>John to Ed. III</i> }	HH	Tabular Illustrations of Abbot of Peterboro's Service, ...	84—85
<i>Hen. III to Hen. VI</i> }	II	Carucates and Fees—examples of, ... ..	77—78
1242	JJ	Examples of Fines for Army of Gascony, ... ..	74
<i>29 Hen. III to Ric. II</i> }	KK	Tabular Illustrations of Feudal Service, mainly from <i>unprinted MSS, ...</i>	93—96
1251—1279	LL	Ramsey Manors—correspondence of Demesne Ploughs, with Demesne Carucates, ...	142
<i>t. Hen. III</i>	MM	Table of Perpetual Aration, ...	111
1278-9	NN	Agricultural Analysis of Manor of Alwalton, ... ..	136
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	OO	Bedfordshire Demesne Carucates—average acreage of (Hundred Rolls), ... ..	141
1379	PP	Claro Wapentake, Yorks; composition of Population <i>per</i> 1000, over 16 years of age ( <i>Poll Tax</i> ), ... ..	120
1696—1897	QQ	Agricultural Statistics of England and Wales, ... ..	113—114

THE ABOVE FORTY-THREE  
TABLES ARRANGED BY SUBJECT MATTER.

<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Reference Numbers.</i>	<i>En-tries.</i>
<i>Agriculture</i> .	B, K to O, Q, R, T, U, LL to OO, QQ	15
<i>Domesday</i> .	A to T . . . . .	20
<i>Feudal Service</i> .	V to Z, AA to KK . . . . .	16
<i>Measures, and</i> } <i>"Measures"</i> }	A, G, N, S, II, LL, OO . . . . .	7
<i>Population</i> .	A, D, E, M, PP . . . . .	5
<i>Præ-Domesday</i> .	A to C . . . . .	3
<i>Yorkshire</i> .	B, C, N, PP . . . . .	4
	Total . . . . .	70

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT, ARRANGED  
CHRONOLOGICALLY AND BY SUBJECTS,  
BUT NOT INCLUDING DETAILS OF ABOVE  
FORTY-THREE TABLES—194 REFERENCES

AGRICULTURE (*Nos. 1—30*).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
A. S.	1	<i>Gebur</i> has of plough oxen ...	2	10
A. S.; etc.	2	Ploughs ... ..	1, 2, 4, and 8 oxen	22
11th cent.	3	Plough ox; Cost of ...	2/6	7
1124	4	Seed Wheat for 1 acre ...	2 seedlips	149
"	5	" Barley " " ...	3 "	149
"	6	" Oats " " ...	4 "	149

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*AGRICULTURE (Nos. 1—30)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1125-8	7	Average acres <i>tilled</i> by villein team (including work on demesne), Peterboro' Manors	64	132
12th & 13th cent.	8	Villeins, Bordars, Cottars; Holdings of	3 acres to 1 virgate	10
12th to 13th cent.	9	Each virgate in villeinage averages at least	4 plough oxen	153, 154
<i>t. Hen. II</i>	10	Welsh Ploughs ... ..	usually 4 oxen	18
1221	11	Northants—part of; No. of teams in ( <i>see</i> No. 71) ...	2613½	33
1222	12	720 arable demesne acres, explanation of why only	3 teams	158
1235-1261	13	<i>Carucarii</i> often hold in villeinage ... ..	3—5 acres	155
<i>t. Hen. III</i>	14	Yield of wheat, per sown acre	10 to 12 bushels	116
„	15	Allowance of corn of farm servant <i>per</i> 12 weeks ...	1 quarter	118
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	16	Areal Hide in Hundred Rolls	120 acres, etc.	32
1279	17	548 demesne acres, tilled by	8 or 8 + teams	143
1333-5	18	Yield of grain per sown acre	10 to 12 bushels	116



STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*AGRICULTURE (Nos. 1—30)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
14th cent.	19	Cost of plough implement	1/-	6
"	20	" " " ox ... ..	15/-	6
t. Elizabeth	21	Ploughland; Acres in ...	60	119
1696	22	Arable acres in rotation: England and Wales ...	10,000,000	113
"	23	Of total arable; sown acres $\frac{2}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3} +$		115, 116
"	24	Pasture and meadow: Eng- land and Wales	10,000,000 acres	113
"	25	Yield of Grain: England and Wales	90,000,000 bushels	115
"	26	Yield of Grain <i>per</i> sown acre	13 to 14 bushels	115, 118
"	27	Grain food of man <i>per</i> head from ... ..	$\frac{9}{20}$ acre	118
"	28	Barley malted in England and Wales	21 $\frac{1}{2}$ million bushels	117
"	29	Beer <i>per</i> head raised from	$\frac{1}{4}$ acre	117
"	30	Beer daily <i>per</i> head... ..	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ pints	117
		See also: Nos. 47 to 57; 64 to 80; 166 to 178; and 180.		

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

DOMESDAY (Nos. 31—80).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
<i>c. 1065</i>	31	<i>Liberi Homines</i> , Sokemen, <i>Homines, Fratres</i> , Thanes, Burgesses, and Radknights (Ellis)	6,000 to 7,000	30
"	32	A.S. Landowners, excluding <i>Liberi Homines</i> , and Soke- men ... ..	<i>c.</i> 13,000	30
1065-1086	33	Landowners A. S. to A. N.	3 : 2	30
1086	34	Recorded Population ...	283,242	2
"	35	" " extended to all England ... ..	<i>c.</i> 300,000	117
"	36	Villeins, bordars, cottars and coscezes, <i>servi</i> ; of total population	$\frac{4}{5}$	I
"	37	Total population ( <i>England</i> )	1,800,000	5
"	38	" capital tenants ...	<i>c.</i> 1,400	68
"	39	Tenants <i>in capite</i> , and Mesne Lords	9,000 to 10,000	30, 102
"	40	Church lands; Value of (in 21 counties) to total	$\frac{3}{10}$	63
"	41	Hides in <i>D. B.</i> in 34 coun- ties (as from <i>Prof. Maitland</i> )	<i>c.</i> 67,000	35
"	42	Places—Number of... ..	15,000 to 18,000	31
"	43	Population <i>per</i> place ...	<i>c.</i> 100	31
"	44	Counties in <i>D. B.</i> ... ..	34	I

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

DOMESDAY (Nos. 31—80)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1086	45	<i>Milites</i> (Ellis) ... ..	137	102
"	46	" ( <i>actually found</i> ) ... ..	700+	103
"	47	Villeins—their holdings ... ..	<i>nil</i> , 7 acres to 2 Hides	10
"	48	" some at Hanwell and West Bedfont	2 fiscal Hides	10, 131
"	49	Villeins—average holdings, Middlesex	1 fiscal virgate	10
"	50	Villeins—Cambridge, in Ely Manors ... ..	10½ acres	10
"	51	Villeins—average holdings, England ( <i>estimated</i> )	20 to 21 acres	11
"	52	Villeins—plough oxen	<i>nil</i> to 3½ teams to 3 villeins	148
"	53	Villeins — average plough oxen not less than ...	2	13, 122
"	54	Bordars—holdings ... ..	<i>nil</i> to 2 bovates	11
"	55	" plough oxen ... ..	<i>nil</i> to 8 oxen	11
"	56	Coscez, " " ... ..	<i>nil</i> to 4 oxen	11
"	57	Cottars, " " ... ..	<i>nil</i> to 6 cottars per team (8 oxen).	11

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*DOMESDAY (Nos. 31—80)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1086	58	<i>Coliberti</i> and <i>Buri</i> ( <i>Ellis</i> ) ...	920	16
"	59	" " " of which found " ... ..	891	16
"	60	<i>Coliberti</i> and <i>Buri</i> on royal Manors, in 48 entries ...	552	16
"	61	<i>Coliberti</i> and <i>Buri</i> on church Manors, in 32 entries ...	311	16
"	62	<i>Coliberti</i> and <i>Buri</i> on lay Manors, in 6 entries ...	28	16
"	63	<i>Coliberti</i> and <i>Buri</i> ; the above 891 in but ... ..	86 entries	16
"	64	Proportion of demesne to total Teams (9 counties) ...	$\frac{3}{10}$	145, 147
"	65	Estimate of demesne to total Arable ... ..	$\frac{2}{5}$	147
"	66	Land <i>tilled</i> by one team ...	64 acres	130
"	67	Teamlands (demesne and villeinage combined), Ely Manors, Norfolk	52 to 53 acres	125, 126
"	68	Teamlands (demesne and villeinage combined), Ely Manors, Suffolk	52 to 53 acres	125, 126
"	69	Number of oxen <i>per</i> team by Domesday scheme ...	8 oxen	6, 146, 147
"	70	Ploughs, all England, esti- mated	84,130 (8 oxen)	117, 121

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

DOMESDAY (Nos. 31—80)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1086	71	Ploughs in co. Northants ( <i>see</i> No. 11)	2,422 (8 oxen)	33
"	72	Examples of <i>one to seven</i> oxen, 1 <i>team</i> , and <i>nine to ten</i> oxen in <i>D. B.</i> , but not of ...	8 oxen	146, 147
"	73	Ploughs (8 oxen each, <i>D. B.</i> ) in the 34 recorded coun- ties	<i>c.</i> 78,000	121, 122, 146
"	74	Ploughs (8 oxen each, <i>D. B.</i> ) in 30 counties	70,606	4, 117
"	75	1000 acres arable supports of recorded population	47 +	123, 124
"	76	1000 acres arable tilled by	<i>c.</i> 16 teams (8 oxen each)	123
"	77	1 acre arable, average rent value ... ..	2d.	140
<i>Wm. I to Ed. I or Ed. II.</i>	78	Some Rochester Manors; Teams, latter to former period ... ..	2 : 1	152
"	79	Some Rochester Manors; demesne Teams, latter to former period ... ..	1 : 1	152
"	80	Some Rochester Manors; villeinage Teams, latter to former period ... ..	9 : 4	152
		See also: Nos. 1 to 2; 82; 84 to 87; 162 to 165; 181 to 184; and 192.		

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

## FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81—161).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
996-1026	81	Military service (cited by <i>J. F. Baldwin</i> )	<i>militiæ statutum</i>	109
<i>t. Wm. I</i>	82	Possible reference to <i>escuage</i> or its <i>antecessor</i> , before	A.D. 1086	81
„	83	Dean of Evreux, <i>bent with age</i> (1066-89), holds of paternal inheritance	1 knight's fee	104
1086	84	Total capital tenants by knight service ( <i>ut de corona</i> ), probably ...	300—	68
1086-1166	85	Knights' Fees, in the <i>D. B. Hides of Prof. Maitland</i>	c. 50,000	79
1086— 12 <i>Car. II</i> }	86	Value of Knight's Fee ...	£2 to £200 p. a.	45
<i>t. Wm. I</i>	87	John holds Teusham of the Abbot of Ely, as	2 knight's fees	109
1088	88	The Bishop of Durham has (not necessarily all feudal tenants) as retainers	100 <i>milites</i>	42
1103	89	Earl Flanders' service to the King of France ...	10 knights	107
1109	90	Aid to marry the daughter of <i>Hen. I</i>	3/- per Hide	83
<i>Hen. I—II</i>	91	Flemish Knights for England	500 and 1000	100a
„	92	Horses <i>per</i> Knight ...	3	100a
1107-8	93	Bigot Roger ( <i>ob.</i> 1107 or 1108) had left in ...	115 fees	108, 109

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81—161)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
<i>t. Hen. I</i>	94	Bayeux Fees ... ..	120 fees	102
"	95	" Service, for 40 days	40 knights	102
<i>Hen. I—II</i>	96	Wages of <i>miles</i> ... ..	4d. (?), and 8d. to 1/-	100 <sup>a</sup>
1163	97	Earl Flanders' service to the King of France ... ..	20 knights	107
11 <i>Hen. I</i>	98	Earl Richard leads <i>in exer-</i> <i>citu</i>	20 knights and 40 <i>servientes</i>	99
1166-1168	99	Number of tenants <i>in capite</i> , <i>ut de corona</i> , by Knight service ... ..	c. 300	51
"	100	Of c. 300 tenants, 11 hold of fees as on p. 51 ... ..	$\frac{1}{4}$	51
"	101	Of c. 300 tenants, 34 hold of fees as on p. 51 ... ..	$\frac{1}{2}$	51
"	102	c. 206 tenants hold ... ..	2 fees +	52
"	103	c. 94 " " ... ..	2 fees & 2—	52
"	104	c. 125 " " ... ..	5 " —	67
"	105	c. 155 " " ... ..	10 " —	67
"	106	c. 145 " " ... ..	10 " and 10 +	67
"	107	Church capital tenants ...	c. 39	67
"	108	Lay " " ... ..	c. 261	67

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81–161)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1166-1168	109	Total Fees, England ...	7173+	65
„	110	Old feoffment, as given	4903 fees	65
„	111	New „ „ „	483 „	65
„	112	Returns by sheriff, as given	745 „	65
„	113	<i>Super dominicum</i> , „ „	315½ „	65
„	114	Deficiency, <i>not</i> returned, estimated at	700 to 800 fees	54
„	115	Total “Service,” England, estimated ... ..	6676+	64
„	116	Estimate of Fees ( <i>Pearson</i> ) .	6400	53
„	117	Number of Fees, of “Services” of more than 100 Knights ... ..	11 cases	99
„	118	Average Lay Fee ... ..	5 to 6 <i>D.B.</i> Hides	43
„	119	Scope of Church Fee ...	12,000 acres	65
„	120	Church fees to total, as by <i>service</i> ... ..	$\frac{1}{6}$ to $\frac{1}{7}$	63
„	121	Scope of Lay Fee ... ..	2,500 acres	65
„	122	Charters—names in ...	c. 4000	103
„	123	„ names holding less than 1 fee ... ..	c. 1600	103



STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81—161)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1166-1168	124	36 $\frac{3}{5}$ fees of Simon de Beauchamp (all of old feoffment), held by ... ..	85 tenants	103
„	125	Charters; “Service” stated	c. 146 cases	57
„	126	Many Examples in Multiples of ... ..	5 fees	67
„	127	A meaningless phrase—feudal service of ... ..	1000 Hides	46
„	128	Honor of Totnes consisted of $49 + 19\frac{4}{5} + \frac{11}{5}$ , that is	75 fees	55
<i>t. Hen. II</i>	129	Normandy—no. of Fees ...	1500, or 1830	102
„	130	„ —Service. ...	581, or 652	102
„	131	Bayeux — „ ...	20 knights	102
„	132	Bayeux fees ... ..	c. 120	102
<i>Hen. II— III</i>	133	Fees of Bishop of Durham .	10, 70 and 150	43
<i>7 John to t. Hen. III</i>	134	Variations of Fees as to Hides and Carucates ( <i>see</i> Nos. 136, 150)	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ to 159 carucates per fee	43, 44
1211	135	Army of Ireland, greatest number of knights of feudal tenant ... ..	10	111
1242	136	Hides per fee, a case of ( <i>see</i> Nos. 134, 150) ... ..	32	75

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81—161)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
38 Hen. III	137	Number of capital tenants ( <i>ut de corona</i> ), by Knight Service ( <i>auxilium</i> ) ...	c. 450	51
„	138	Fees omitted in above record	775 +	51
38 Hen. III	139	Total fees ( <i>render</i> ) ...	6734 +	51
„	140	Number of Fees, of “ Ser- vices ” of more than 100 knights ...	9 cases	99
„	141	Of 5959 fees (returned) with c. 439 tenants <i>in capite</i> ( <i>ut de</i> <i>corona</i> ) of all the fees, 9 feudatories hold ...	$\frac{1}{4}$	51
„	142	Of 5959 fees (returned) with c. 439 tenants <i>in capite</i> ( <i>ut de</i> <i>corona</i> ) of all the fees, 29 feudatories hold ...	$\frac{1}{2}$	51
„	143	Re above, 204 tenants hold	2 fees +	51
„	144	„ „ 235 „ „	2 fees and 2 fees —	51
„	145	The Luterell fee ( <i>see</i> Nos. 148, 151), assessed to an <i>aux-</i> <i>ilium</i> at ...	12½ fees	89, 90
t. Hen. III	146	Estimated number of Ban- neters and Bachelors ...	1000 to 1500	99
Hen. III— Ed. II	147	Period of service <i>in exercitu</i> .	40 days	102
5 Ed. I	148	The Luterell fee, discharged by service <i>in exercitu</i> ( <i>see</i> also Nos. 145, 151) of ...	2 Knights	88

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81—161)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1284	149	Pact with a <i>miles</i> for quit- tance of service of 1 fee (recognised in <i>exercitu</i> ), in the Welsh war, for ...	£20	100
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	150	Hides per fee, a case of ( <i>see</i> Nos. 134, 136) ...	2	78
10 <i>Ed. I</i>	151	The Luterell fee ( <i>see</i> Nos. 145, 148), in default of service in <i>exercitu</i> , and <i>presumably</i> no fine having been taken, pays Scutage, 35 years after said army, on ...	12½ fees	95
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	152	The Bishop of Durham has in the Scotch war (not necessarily as his service, <i>i.e.</i> 10)	26 Ban- nerets, 140 Knights	42
1300	153	The same has at Caer- laverock	160 men at arms	42
4 <i>Ed. II</i>	154	Expenses of 1 <i>miles</i> for the Scotch war	60 marcs +	100
1346	155	Fees found at this date (36 counties) ...	c. 6000	69
20 <i>Ed. III</i>	156	Fees in Cornwall ...	165¾	70
„	157	English Earls, Bannerets, and Knights, at Calais ...	c. 1063	98
„	158	English Esquires, at Calais	c. 3000	98

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*FEUDAL SERVICE (Nos. 81—161)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
4 Hen. IV	159	Returns at £1 <i>per</i> fee of tenants "in capite," by Knight Service (30 counties), and of capital socagers (£20 land as for 1 fee)	£1075	70
"	160	Cornwall Fees held "in capite" ( <i>i.e. demesne</i> ) ...	$\frac{1}{2}$ fee	70
1630-2	161	Knighthood Money ( <i>i.e.</i> distraint, <i>t. Car. I</i> ) ...	£100,000 or £173,537 9s. 6d.	97
		See also: Nos. 33; 38 to 40; 45 to 46; 176; 179; and 193 to 194.		

## MEASURES AND "MEASURES" (Nos. 162—180).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1086	162	Hide, Scope of ...	c. 400 acres	41
"	163	1 fiscal <i>sulung</i> perhaps ...	160 fiscal acres	39
"	164	1 " jugum " ...	40 fiscal acres	39, 153
"	165	Cornish fiscal Acre ...	c. 10 nor- mal fiscal acres	38
1125-1128	166	Old measure of <i>presumably</i> seed for 1 acre	1 <i>acher-</i> <i>setum</i>	161

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

MEASURES AND "MEASURES" (Nos. 162—180)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
<i>Hen. II— John</i>	167	A quarter (sometimes of 8 bushels), as compared with quarter in No. 173, not more than ... ..	$\frac{1}{2}$	159
„	168	This smaller quarter approximates to	1 horse load	160
14 <i>John</i>	169	The King's carthorses have 1 bushel each (old, small measure), of which the quarter sells at ... ..	10d. to 1/-	160
<i>c. 1240</i>	170	1 Hide=4 Virgates= ...	48 acres	37
„	171	„ = „ = ...	256 acres	38
<i>t. Hen. III</i>	172	A farm horse has of oats (query in Measure as in No. 173) ... ..	$\frac{1}{8}$ bushel	160
<i>Hen. III to Hen. VII</i>	173	1 Quarter=8 bushels of 64 lbs. (old Troy) each, each lb. made up of	7680 wheat grains	158
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	174	Bedfordshire — demesne carucates,—average of ...	$91\frac{1}{5}$ acres	141
1279	175	$5\frac{1}{2}$ Hides Arable + 5 Hides of Meadow, Pasture, and Marsh + (query)=	11 rateable Hides	140
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	176	Allowance of a <i>destrier</i> in oats ... ..	$\frac{1}{2}$ bushel	160
„	177	Allowance of a cart-horse in oats ... ..	$\frac{1}{4}$ bushel	160

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*MEASURES AND "MEASURES" Nos. 162—180—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
<i>t. Ed. I</i>	178	Kentish iugum ... ..	40 acres	153
1560	179	Weight (rider and total armour) carried by a cer- tain <i>destrier</i>	361 lbs. modern avoird.	160
1900	180	1 lb. <i>avoirdupois</i> of well dried wheat grains ... ..  See also—Nos. 4 to 6; 15 to 16; 21; 41; 47 to 51; 54; 67 to 69; 72; 85; 90; 119; 121; 126 to 127; 134; 136; 150; 182 to 183; and 192.	7000	159

## POPULATION (Nos. 181—188).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
<i>Heptarchy.</i>	181	Population of England ...	c. 1,500,000 to 2,000,000	29
„	182	Part of England; land of ...	250,000 families	29
<i>t. Bede</i>	183	Isle of Wight; land of ...	1,200 families	29
1086	184	„ „ recorded population ... ..	1,124	29
1347	185	England and Wales; popu- lation ... ..	c. 4,000,000	5, 121

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

POPULATION (Nos. 181—188)—*contd.*

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1377	186	England and Wales; popu- lation ... ..	c. 2,700,000	5, 121
1688	187	Houses in England and Wales ... ..	1,300,000	115
1696	188	Population in England and Wales  See also: Nos. 31 to 39; 43; 45 to 46; 58 to 63; 75; 84; 99; 107 to 108; 122 to 123; 137; 141 to 144; 146; 157 to 158; 161; and 190.	5,500,000 to 7,000,000	115

PLACES AND PARISHES—ENGLAND (Nos. 189—190).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1371	189	Parishes in England (less Cheshire) ... ..	8,600	31
„	190	Population <i>per</i> parish ...  See also: Nos. 42 to 44.	c. 300	31

PRÆ-DOMESDAY.

See Nos. 1 to 2; 31 to 33; 81 to 83; and 181 to 183.

STATISTICAL INDEX OF TEXT—*contd.*

## SOCAGE (No. 191).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
4 <i>Hen. IV</i>	191	Cornwall; Socage <i>in capite</i> . See also No. 159.	<i>nil</i>	70

## YORKSHIRE (Nos. 192—194).

<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ref. Nos.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Statistics.</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1086 onwards	192	Liberty of Ripon; acres in .	<i>c.</i> 40,000	63, 127
20 <i>Ed. III</i>	193	Fees, W. R., Yorks ... ..	<i>c.</i> 150	69
4 <i>Hen. IV</i>	194	„ „ „ held <i>in capite</i> ( <i>i.e.</i> <i>demesne</i> ) ...	<i>c.</i> 12	69
		See also : Nos. 88; 133; 145; 148; and 151 to 153.		



## SUMMARY OF INDEX AND TABLES.

*(But not including detailed statistics in latter).*

## STATISTICAL INDEX.

	<i>Direct Entries.</i>	<i>Under other Heads.</i>	<i>Table Entries</i>	<i>Total Entries.</i>
Agriculture ... ..	30	42	15	87
Domesday ... ..	50	16	20	86
Feudal Service ... ..	81	10	16	107
Measures and "Measures"	19	29	7	55
Population ... ..	8	35	5	48
Places and Parishes ...	2	3	—	5
Præ-Domesday ... ..	—	11	3	14
Socage ... ..	1	1	—	2
Yorkshire ... ..	3	7	4	14
Totals ...	194	154	70	418

TABLES FROM THOMAS RUDBORNE'S  
WINCHESTER HISTORY,*Under the year 1083, but presumably written in the reign of  
Henry the Sixth.\*†*

3 grains of barley, dry and round	make	1 inch ( <i>pollex</i> ).
12 inches	„	1 foot ( <i>pes</i> ).
3 feet	„	1 yard ( <i>ulna</i> ).
5½ yards	„	1 perch ( <i>pertica</i> ).
20 ( <i>sic</i> ) *1 by 4 perches	„	1 acre ( <i>acra</i> ).

\*† The author may of course have used older materials, but Section II seems inconsistent with a date earlier than Hen III (*vide* p. 159), and the Escuage Tables could scarcely apply prior to Ed. I (the amount being fixed, *vide etiam* p. 96); all the items however [saving that one noted (\*2) as not understood], appear proper to the 15th cent.

\*1. This is an obvious error, presumably of the pen.

TABLES FROM THOMAS RUDBORNE'S  
WINCHESTER HISTORY—*contd.*

1 penny ( <i>denarius</i> ). [called <i>Starelyng</i> , round without clipping, will weigh 32 grains of wheat, in the midst of the ear ( <i>spica</i> ) ]	<i>weighs</i>	32 wheat grains.
20 pence	<i>weigh</i>	1 ounce.
12 ounces, according to the English currency ( <i>cursus</i> )	,,	1 lb., <i>i.e.</i> , 20/-
8 lbs. of wheat	<i>make</i>	1 gallon ( <i>lagena</i> ).
8 gallons [make a bushel ( <i>modius</i> ), according to the measure ( <i>mensura</i> ) of London]	,,	1 London measure.
8 bushels ( <i>modii</i> )	,,	1 quarter
250 lbs. of sterlings *2 ( <i>sic</i> )	,,	1 bushel ( <i>bussellus</i> ).
4 virgates ( <i>virgæ</i> ) *3 make 1 Hide	<i>being</i>	64 acres of land.
5 Hides make 1 Knight's Fee	,,	320 " " "
Each Knight's Fee	will give for Scutage	40/-
{ " $\frac{1}{2}$ " " <i>i.e.</i> , 160 acres of land	,, " " " "	20/-
{ " $\frac{1}{3}$ Knight's Fee, <i>i.e.</i> , 106 $\frac{1}{2}$ ( <i>sic</i> ) acres of land ... ..	,, " " " "	12/- ( <i>sic</i> ).
1 $\frac{1}{4}$ Hides, <i>i.e.</i> , 24 *4 ( <i>sic</i> ) acres of land ...	,, " " " "	10/-
$\frac{1}{5}$ Knight's Fee, <i>i.e.</i> , 64 acres of land ...	,, " " " "	8/-
$\frac{1}{10}$ Knight's Fee, <i>i.e.</i> , 33 ( <i>sic</i> ) acres of land	,, " " " "	4/-
$\frac{1}{16}$ Knight's Fee, <i>i.e.</i> , 20 acres of land ...	,, " " " "	24d. $\frac{3}{4}$ ( <i>sic</i> ).

\*2. The explanation of this entry is unknown to the writer.

\*3. Suppose a clerical error for *virgata*.

\*4. A slip of the pen, or printer, for four score.

## CHAPTER I

### DOMESDAY STATISTICS

“Cæterum tota vita ita fortunatus fuit, vt exteræ & remotæ gentes, nihil magis, quam nomen eius timerent. Prouinciales adeo nutu suo subtrauerat, vt sine ulla contradictione primus censum omnium capitum ageret, omnium prædiorū redditus in tota Anglia notitiæ suæ per scriptum adiiceret, omnes liberos homines cuiuscunq; essent, suæ fidelitati sacramento adigeret.”

[Willielmi Malmesburiensis,  
curâ H. Sauile.]

**D**OMESDAY BOOK gives much information which can be displayed in statistical tables—to wit, as to population, plough-teams, ploughlands, hidage, past and present values: it should be borne in mind that thirty-four counties are enumerated; of the remaining six, Monmouth was then in Wales, Northumberland and Durham are not found: in the Yorkshire “Survey” Cumberland and Westmoreland are slightly noticed, and most of North Lancashire, the remainder of that county being found under Cheshire. For fuller information as to the recorded population, reference can be made to Ellis’ “Introduction to Domesday Book” (1833), from which the underwritten figures are taken: in the thirty-four counties (as then

Population  
and  
counties.

constituted) is a total of 283,242 recorded folk, of which, in rough percentages :

				%
Villans	...	...	108,456	38
Bordars	...	...	82,624	29
Servi	...	...	25,156	9
Sokemen	...	...	23,090	8
Liberi Homines	...	...	12,384	4
Burgesses	...	...	7,968	3
Mesne Lords	...	...	7,871	3
Cottars	...	...	6,819	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
Tenants-in-chief	...	...	1,400	$\frac{1}{2}$
Homines	...	...	1,287	$\frac{2}{5}$

making a sum of 277,055, or some 98 % of the whole, the most prominent of the remainder being 995 presbyters, 920 coliberti, 749 *bovarii*, 565 radknights, 467 female servants, 427 *porcarii*, 354 Frenchmen, 207 of the establishment of Bury St. Edmund's Monastery, 178 paupers, 159 censarii, 137 milites, 111 Welshmen, 111 fishermen, and 108 salt-workers. It should be noticed that almost four-fifths of the population are comprised under villans, bordars, cottars, and servi, and in the following table (p. 3) it will be seen that in more than three-fourths of the thirty-four counties, nine-tenths of the population are composed of villans, bordars, cottars, servi, sokemen, and liberi homines.

The county constitution table is intended to show features peculiar to districts: in each shire the whole of the recorded population is accounted for, save from 5 % to 0 %, and all classes are noted which amount to or exceed 1 % in all of the thirty-four counties.

COUNTY CONSTITUTION TABLE.

	Villans.	Bordars and Cottars.	Servi.	Sokemen and Lib. Hom.	Total.	Tenants-in-Chief and Mesne Lords.	Oxherds.	Burgesses.	Homines.	Presbyters.	Radknights.	Censarii.	Porcarii.	Female Servants.	Coliberti.	Frenchmen.	Welsh.	Mon. St. Edmund's.	At Tutbury Market.	Total.
England ...	38	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	12	91															100
Beds ...	47	30	12	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Berks ...	41 $\frac{1}{2}$	40 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	94 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bucks ...	53 $\frac{1}{2}$	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	93 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cambs ...	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	41 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	92 $\frac{1}{2}$	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cheshire ...	34	27	8	2	71	7	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	I	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	..	..	..	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	96 $\frac{1}{2}$
Cornwall ...	32	43 $\frac{1}{2}$	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	96 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Derby ...	60 $\frac{1}{2}$	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	89	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	100
Devon ...	46 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	19	..	93 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dorset ...	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	42 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	..	92	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Essex ...	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	50	11	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Gloucester	43 $\frac{1}{2}$	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	90	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	..	I	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Hants ...	37	38	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	..	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	I	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Hereford ...	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	..	79 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	2	..	4	..	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	..	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	..	..	..	..	95
Herts ...	37	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	I	88 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	..	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	I	..	..	..	..	..	I	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Hunts ...	66 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	84	4	..	10	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Kent ...	54	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	92 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{5}{8}$	..	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Leicester ...	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	20	6	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	93 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	..	I	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Lincs ...	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	..	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	92	2	..	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Middlesex	50 $\frac{1}{2}$	35 $\frac{1}{2}$	5	..	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	..	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
Norfolk ...	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	37	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	33 $\frac{1}{2}$	91 $\frac{3}{8}$	1 $\frac{1}{8}$	..	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Northants	46	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{3}{8}$	12 $\frac{3}{8}$	93 $\frac{1}{4}$	4	..	I	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{4}$
Notts ...	45 $\frac{1}{2}$	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	92 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	3	..	I	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oxon ...	52 $\frac{1}{2}$	28	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	94 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Rutland ...	84 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	98	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	I	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	100
Salop ...	35	23 $\frac{1}{2}$	17	..	76	4	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	I	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	I	..	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	96 $\frac{1}{2}$
Somerset	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	91	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Staffs ...	54 $\frac{1}{2}$	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 $\frac{3}{8}$	..	90	5 $\frac{1}{8}$	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Suffolk ...	13	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	41 $\frac{1}{2}$	90	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	I	..	98
Surrey ...	54	27 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	..	92 $\frac{3}{8}$	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sussex ...	56 $\frac{1}{2}$	31 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	..	92	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	99 $\frac{1}{2}$
Warwick ..	53 $\frac{1}{2}$	27	13	..	93 $\frac{3}{8}$	3 $\frac{1}{8}$	..	..	..	I	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	97 $\frac{3}{8}$
Wilts ...	30 $\frac{1}{2}$	44	15	..	89	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{1}{2}$
Worcester	32	38 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	86 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	..	..	..	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	..	..	..	..	..	97 $\frac{3}{4}$
Yorks ..	63	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	4	..	I	..	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	98 $\frac{3}{8}$

MAIN STATISTICAL TABLE.

	(Census Ancient Counties.) Area, 1891.	ELLIS. Re- corded Popula- tion, 1086.	MAITLAND.				PEARSON.	
			Hidage,* 1065-86.	Dane- geld, <i>circa</i> 1150.	Plough- teams, 1086.	Potential Plough- lands, 1086.	Valets in Pounds, 1086.	Valuits in Pounds, 1065.
Beds ..	298,494	3,875	1,193	1,106	1,367	1,557	1,096½	1,474½
Berks ..	462,224	6,324	2,473	2,056	1,796	2,087	2,383½	2,378½
Bucks ..	475,694	5,420	2,074	2,047	1,952	2,244	1,813½	1,785½
Cambs ..	549,749	5,204	1,233	1,148	1,443	1,676		
Cheshire ..	657,068	2,349	512					
Cornwall ..	868,208	5,438	155	227	1,187	2,377	662	729½
Derby* ..	658,876	3,041	679	*1121	862	762	461¼	631¼
Devon ..	1,667,097	17,434	1,119	1,040	5,542	7,972	3,220½	2,912
Dorset ..	632,272	7,807	2,321	2,482	1,762	2,332	2,656½	2,564½
Essex ..	987,028	16,060	2,650	2,364	3,920	..	4,784½	4,098
Gloucester ..	795,734	8,366	2,388	1,941	3,768	..	2,827½	2,855½
Hants ..	1,037,764	10,373	2,588	1,848	2,614	2,847		
Hereford ..	537,363	5,368	1,324	938	2,479			
Herts ..	406,161	4,927	1,050	1,101	1,406	1,716	1,541¾	1,894¾
Hunts ..	234,218	2,914	747	713	967	1,120	864¾	890¾
Kent ..	995,344	12,205	1,224	1,058	3,102	..	5,140½	3,953½
Leicester ..	527,124	6,772	[? 2,500]	1,000	1,817	..	736¼	491¼
Lincs ..	1,693,547	25,305	4,188	2,660	4,712	5,043		
Middlesex ..	181,301	2,302	868	856	545	664	754¼	910¾
Norfolk ..	1,308,440	27,087	[? 2,422]*	3,301	4,853	..	4,154½	2,219½
Northants ..	641,992	8,441	1,356	1,195	2,422	2,931	1,843	1,407½
Notts* ..	539,752	5,686	567	*1121	1,991	1,255		
Oxon ..	483,614	6,775	2,412	2,498	2,467	2,639	3,242¼	2,789¾
Rutland ..	97,273	862	37	116	[239]			
Salop ..	859,516	5,080	1,245	1,179	1,755			
Somerset ..	1,043,485	13,764	2,951	2,775	3,804	4,812	[4,161¼]	
Staffs ..	749,601	3,178	499	451	951	1,398	[516¾]	
Suffolk ..	952,709	20,491	[ ]	2,350				
Surrey ..	485,128	4,383	1,830	1,798	1,142	1,172	1,524½	1,417½
Sussex ..	933,269	10,410	3,474	2,170	3,091	..	3,255½	3,467
Warwick ..	577,462	6,574	1,338	1,280	2,003	2,276	1,359	95¾
Wilts ..	880,248	10,150	4,050	3,896	2,997	3,457		
Worcester ..	480,560	4,625	1,189	1,013	1,889	..	991	1,060½
Yorks ..	3,882,848	8,055	10,095	1,655	[2,959]			
	27,506,622 acres.	283,242	34 counties, <i>circa</i> *67,000	30* counties, <i>circa</i> 47,628	30 counties, 70,606	21 counties, 52,354	23 counties, 49,658li	21 counties, 45,744 li

\* The Hides are awfully overestimated (*D. B. and Beyond*, p. 409), including dormant ones and duplicates (*D. B.* sometimes states a total, and then repeats same Hides in particulars), to distinguish which *both* reading and counting are often necessary: the writer holds that the Norfolk carucates have no reference to Hidage (see note, p. 12); Yorks, Suffolk, and Rutland are omitted in the Danegeld total, but Derby and Notts together equate 1,121 Hides (here *carucates*).

The main statistical table is a compilation, the acreage being from the census of 1891 (ancient counties), the population from Ellis, the valets and valuits from pp. 665-669 of Pearson's "English History," and the rest from Professor Maitland's "Domesday Book and Beyond," with small additions.

Main statistical table.

As to population, some of the boroughs of 1086 (notably London and Winchester) are omitted in D. B. (Domesday Book), and presumably a considerable proportion of the inhabitants of West Yorkshire, and all in North Lancashire: however, the same persons are sometimes mentioned more than once, and females occur notably as ancillæ. In the present state of our knowledge, 2,000,000 total population would be an extreme figure for the forty counties of modern England for 1086: it is probable, from the poll-tax returns of 1377, that at that date the population might well lie between  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and 3 millions, and prior to the Black Death (1348-49) 4,000,000 and upwards, whereas 1,800,000 might be a reasonable postulate from D. B. for 1086.

Population 1086 and 1377.

The hides in the table include the carucates of the Danish districts and the sulungs of Kent, and are estimated for the thirty-four recorded counties; for 1065-1086 they must be regarded as units of assessment, not in any obvious connection with area or value, and the underwritten equations seem to prevail in D. B.:

Units of assessment.

1 hide	= 4 virgates	= 120 fiscal acres.	
1 carucate	= 8 bovates	= 120	„
1 sulung	= 4 juga*	= 120	„

\* See, note p. 39.

The above terms were also used as mediæval areal measures, and when normal the same equations held; the variations are well known, *e.g.*, 1 carucate might contain 64 acres (8 per bovate), or 1 hide, 5 virgates of 28 acres each, and so forth, so that it is necessary to know the mensuration in use at a given date in any particular manor when dealing with actual quantities (and yet at the same date in the same manor one equation might not be sufficient for all the lands in it—*e.g.*, Ramsey Chartulary).

Plough-  
team.

The plough-team is often (if not always) in D. B. at the rate of eight oxen per plough, but there seem to have been actual ploughs of one, two, and four oxen, etc.: the enumeration of ploughs by the rate of eight oxen, of course, predicates no similar uniformity in practice. To record actual husbandry would have been difficult, but to assume a like number of oxen per plougha proceeding eminently rational for statistical purposes: it has been argued that the ploughs (as recorded) varied, which does not greatly flatter the wisdom of the compilers of our national record, and seems to be inconsistent with evidence like the following:

Fo. 304*a*.—Bilton: 13 villans with 2 ploughs, and 5 oxen.

Fo. 312*a*.—Borell: 2 villans with 6 oxen.

Fo. 314*a*.—Naburn: 3 oxen ploughing there.

Fo. 319*a*.—Stainton: 2 villans and 3 bordars ploughing with 2 oxen.

Fo. 323*b*.—Dringoe: 1 villan with 2 oxen.

Fo. 325*a*.—Newsholme: Ralph has now  $\frac{1}{2}$  plough and 1 villan with 2 oxen.

Fo. 328*a*.—Aluengi: 1 villan and 2 oxen.\*

Compara-  
tive values  
of imple-  
ments and  
oxen.

\* In the fourteenth century a plough might be valued at 1*s.*, and a single ox at about 15*s.*; if this comparison even



that is to say, if D. B. counts a plough of two or four oxen as one whole plough on its system of record, the authors of this theory are burdened with the explanation of expressions as above.

The ploughland leaves some room for estimation, but Professor Maitland's figures show that it usually varies not widely from the teams; in some cases, as in the wasted Yorkshire manors, his surmise that the potential were the actual ploughlands of King Edward's day seems natural, but it does not meet an entry like the following from that county (fo. 299*a*): "land to 42 ploughs, 7½ there now, and formerly 46 teams." Again, he quotes as an instance of inexplicable divergence the Rutlandshire entries (fo. 293*b* and 294*a*, and "Domesday Book and Beyond," p. 471) of 48 ploughlands and 127 teams; but in the first place he seems to have omitted to note the teamlands were 14 plus 48, and in the second that the villenage teams were probably those of small burgesses wealthy enough to have oxen in excess of the requirements of co-operative agriculture (a similar entry occurs on fo. 316*b*, Tateshale), and rather comparable to farmers of the present day with arable from 1 to 30 acres and a pair of horses.

Having just noted the fact of actual normal hides of 120 acres, and roughly allowed a plough-team to a ploughland, the inference may seem to follow that a plough tilled 120 acres arable; but

Plough-  
land.

Area *not*  
tilled by  
one  
plough.

---

approximately holds for the eleventh century, when the ox is taken at 2s. 6d., it seems inconceivable that the return of teams should be made from the actual implements in use rather than from the oxen.

that is exactly what is not suggested, and which, I believe, can be demonstrated did not occur. Should any practical agriculturist honour my pages by his perusal, he must bear in mind there are who believe that not 120 acres, but even 180, of arable were tilled in one year by one plough; certain it is he will be as little able to credit such unheard of practices in his art as the real existence of the dragons etc., of our monastic chroniclers. Whilst those abstracted from terrestrial affairs may conceive such astounding husbandry, he can never have been so fortunate as to have seen or heard of it (saving steam-ploughing) in any ordinary tillage routine of this country, nor will he allow the speculations of scholars the colour of superior knowledge. For what of credence would be given to the mathematician who persistently found a product of five from the addition of two and two, or to the classical instructor who rendered *tenet* and *valet* as *tenuit* and *valuit*; just so when writers on matters rural inform their readers of the non-existence of the mediæval harrow, or gravely repeat that in ploughing an acre three miles (two leucæ) are traversed, or that from  $\frac{7}{8}$  to all 1 acre could be ploughed before mid-day.\*

\* But the profundity of the erudite mind is best discovered in a statement of the Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford (p. 123, "Social England," vol. i.), where for every perch of " $16\frac{1}{2}$  feet," for a furrow of "eleven inches broad," the "plow" is made to traverse the distance in "4 or  $4\frac{1}{2}$ " rounds: with such a furrow of course 22 inches would be done per round, making just 9 journeys to and fro. It is to be hoped that the promoters of the Agricultural Education

The first may possibly be an instance of *college farming*, as it occurs in Professor Rogers' "History of Agriculture," and is repeated in that singular unbending of University erudition to popular requirements ("Social England") by the writer on "Agriculture": though no one should be so exacting as to seek particular knowledge of so base an art from scribes of scholarly attainments, it may be pointed out that the Bayeux Tapestry and Loutrell Psalter (c. 1340) give undeniable pictorial representations of harrowing; again, D. B. (fo. 163 and 166) notes the practice—also the Burton Chartulary (1114), and, indeed, almost every custumal of any length, works which historical writers might well condescend to.

The second is quoted on p. 58 (Taylor's "Analysis of Glos'ter Domesday Book," 1889)—now, if the ploughing of an acre is too hard a problem in arithmetic to design on paper, any ploughman could testify he goes about 10 miles per acre—*i.e.*, with a furrow of 8 inches 12 miles, with a 12-inch one 8 miles, or 8 to  $5\frac{1}{3}$  leucæ.

The last occurs on p. 377, note 4 ("Domesday Book and Beyond"), where the author corrects Miss Lamond's rendering of *a noune*, from 3 p.m. to 12 mid-day—the technical point I cannot pretend to discuss, but on p. 415 (vol. i., Ramsey

---

Extension System from our fountains of learning may commence at home, by giving those pioneers who are to enlighten the supposed darkness of the rural mind, such an elementary knowledge of arithmetic, as to place them on somewhat more even terms with the average *carucarius* in matters of simple addition, division, etc.

Cart.), it may be observed, "apud dinariam" occurs in point of time before "ad nonam."

*Valets and  
Valuits.*

*Villani.*

Reserving the discussion of how much land may or may not be assigned to a plough for the sequel, let it be noted that the *valets* and *valuits* of 1086 and 1065 seem to represent the yearly profits of manors from whatever cause arising, and that the term *villani* is used to distinguish the whole class of villans, bordars, etc., holding by base tenure from the *liberi homines*, and that tenants in villenage were free, except as against their lord. The Villan\* proper would seem to have held from 7 acres (Wiceford, fo. 192a, D. B., 17 villans each of 7 acres) to 2 hides (Hanwell and West Bedfont D. B., co. Middlesex), with rights of pasturage; let it be observed that these may be assessed rather than areal quantities, and that, in the case of villans of 1 and 2 hides (if areal), these were not all arable land, and may have been partly held at a rent. Seebohm (p. 102, "English Village Community") allows the average villan 20 to 21 acres in 1086, but considers the A.S. gebur of 30 acres and 2 oxen, to answer to the normal villan of the same amount: according to the Middlesex Domesday an average villan is rated at 1 virgate; in the I. E. (Cantab.) at  $10\frac{1}{2}$  acres; the later custumals give examples of holdings of 3, 5,  $7\frac{1}{2}$ , 10, 15, 20 acres, and virgates for the classes embraced by the D. B. villans, bordars and cottars, and precise definition of each

*Opera.*

\* Villans usually owe week work and precatons, sokemen the latter; in 1321 (*Hist. Pet.*) free tenants as opposed to socagers appear to owe no *works* of any kind; see note, pp. 147-9.

grade is difficult. The estimate of 20-1 acres of workland for an average villan seems at any rate ample; possibly the Middlesex villans assessed in quantities exceeding  $\frac{1}{2}$  hide may answer to the thirteenth-century class who held both at work and at rent, bearing in mind that Yorkshire, Middlesex, and Surrey were, in proportion to their teams, the counties most highly rated to *gheld*.

The bordar\* occurs in each county, the cottar\* in but 18, nevertheless these terms are sometimes interchangeable; the whole class may be broadly assessed up to 10 acres, and where both occur together, the former considered the larger tenant. The bordar frequently had an ox or oxen, (sometimes also the cottar as distinct from the bordar); and custumals demonstrate that owners of 3 to 5 acres might have an ox or more, and subsequently I shall show that the holder of a virgate in the thirteenth century may often be rated at 4 oxen. The disappearance of the name (as a name) bordar is to be noted; also the presence of the class in towns, and the use of the terms  $\frac{1}{2}$  villans and

Bordars  
and  
Cottars.

\* Bordars occur as *paying rent*, D. B. 52a, from 20 masuræ, 14s.; 167b, 38 with  $7\frac{1}{2}$  pls., pay 8s.; 264b, 1 renders 2s.; as to *amount of land* from nothing up to 2 bovates (by 1 man), see 353b; and 84b, 2 held  $\frac{1}{4}$  freely, and now hold; 139b, 46 hold 8 ac. each; 190a, nine each 5 ac.—together 2 pls.; and the following 20 references (a selection only) from as many counties demonstrate they often *had separate plough oxen*, 14a, 17b, 52b, 70b, 82b, 94a, 117a, 120a (13 to 1 pl., lowest in list), 160b, 177b, 180a (1 bordar 1 pl., highest found), 205b, 215b, 222a, 241b, 250b, 259b, 274b, 285b, 331b; on 186a, 12 *work* one day per week: Coscez and Cottars sometimes also had pls., thus Coscez 71b, two, 1 pl.; 72a, four,  $\frac{1}{2}$  pl.; 72b, 6 and 1 cottar,  $\frac{1}{2}$  pl.; 74b, four,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  pls.; 74b, eight, 1 pl.; Cottars, 97b, six, 1 pl.

Illustrations of  
same from  
Domesday.

$\frac{1}{2}$  bordars, giving ground to suppose that occasionally full villans and bordars may be fractionally composed: in such a case (fo. 324a, D. B.) as 30 villans and 3 ploughs it is equally hard to imagine more than 30 men, less than 24 oxen, or as much as 900 acres of land (*i.e.*, the "so-called" normal villan of 30 acres  $\times$  30).

*Servi.*

The servi were a class personally unfree, notable in S.W. England: in that name they soon disappeared, becoming presumably free labourers and cottars.

*Sokemen.*

The sokemen\* make a particular figure in E. England, and were under a lord with varying liberties as regarded their land—sometimes they had one lord for soke and another for commendation, and though not rarely performing base services may be referred to the class of *liberi homines* as opposed to tenants in villenage: at least on one occasion the I. C. Cant. enumerates as villans the sokemen\* of D. B. (Wilberton, co. Cambs). In the absence of precise figures Seebohm's estimate of 22-3 acres as an average holding is noted; in the custumals the smaller freemen seem often of less importance than holders of virgates in villenage.

The *liberi homines*\* as a sub-class are inconsider-

\* The population assigned to these classes is probably quite unreliable, and members thereof must appear more than once in the record; the *villani* may be roughly rated at 3 per team (8 oxen): taking the 9067 freemen and sokemen (Ellis) of *Norfolk* they can only be assessed at a like no. of teams as the 4731 villans, on the supposition that neither the lords nor other of the community had plough oxen. If the 7723 villans of Lincs. are taken at above rate, there will be but  $1\frac{1}{2}$  oxen each left for 11,504 sokemen (4712 teams in the

able out of Norfolk and Suffolk; Seebohm assesses their holdings at 42 acres; sokemen and *liberi homines* may occasionally have been interchangeable terms, at the same time noting that the latter is used also for the whole class of superior tenantry, viz., tenants in chief, mesne lords, *liberi homines*, and presumably radknights and drengs as distinguishing them from tenants in villenage.

The radknights, comprising the *radchenistri* and *radmanni*, were as peculiar to the W. Midlands as the sokemen and *liberi homines* to the E. shires; they amount to 2 % of the recorded population, and may possibly be regarded as the antecessors of tenants by serjeantry. Rad-knights.

The tenants in chief (about  $\frac{1}{2}$  % of the population) held their lands directly of the King (*sine medio*) and the mesne lords (some  $2\frac{4}{5}$  % of population) held of the former, or of other vassals holding of the King's tenants. Tenants in chief.

For the rest, it must suffice that the *coliberti*\* *Coliberti* and *Buri*. seem to have equated the *buri*,\* and to have ranked

co.) on the same theory; as the lords and others could scarcely have owned less than  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the teams in either county it seems clear that freemen and sokemen are indeterminable both as to numbers and extent of holding. The application of the 4 ox per plough theory as in D. B. (Seebohm) is strikingly refuted here: the evidence for the rest of England (excepting Lincs., Norf., and Suff.) demonstrates the average villan could not have had less than 2 oxen.

\* Prof. Maitland (p. 37, "D. B. and Beyond") endeavours to equate this class with the A.S. *geburi*, in order to appreciate the *villani*; whilst admiring his sympathetic leanings to the latter, such are scarcely the results of studies in Domesday Book. The *geburs* occur in the Laws of Ine; as servile tenants of Tiddenham (10th cent.), and in a like condition These do not correspond with *Geburi*.

## COMPARATIVE TABLE

Population by Teams (30 Counties).			Population by Teams (21 Counties.)			Hides by Gheld (30 Counties).		
Norfolk ...	5'5	255	Lincs ...	5'370	230	Cornwall ...	'7	180
Lincs ...	5'3		Cornwall ...	4'58		Norfolk ...	'73	
			Dorset ...	4'4				
Cornwall ...	4'5	{ 200	Middlesex ...	4'2	130	Dorset ...	'93	100
Dorset ...	4'4		Hants ...	3'968		Herts ...	'95	
Middlesex ...	4'2	100	Surrey ...	3'8	100	Bucks ...	1'01	50
E-sex ...	4'0		Somerset ...	3'6		Middlesex ...	1'01	
Kent ...	3'9		Cambs ...	3'6		Surrey ...	1'02	
Hants ...	3'9	50	Derby ...	3'5	25	Oxon ...	1'03	
Surrey ...	3'8		Berks ...	3'5		Warwick ...	1'04	
			Herts ...	3'5		Wilts ...	1'04	
Leicester ...	3'7	25	Northants ...	3'4	25	Hunts ...	1'05	
Somerset ...	3'6		Wilts ...	3'38		Salop ...	1'05	
Cambs ...	3'6		Staffs ...	3'342		Somerset ...	1'06	
Derby ...	3'5	25	Warwick ...	3'2	25	Beds ...	1'08	25
Berks ...	3'5		Devon ...	3'145		Cambs ...	1'08	
Herts ...	3'5		Hunts ...	3'0		Devon ...	1'08	
Northants ...	3'4	25	Notts ...	2'8	50	Derby ...	1'13	
Staffs ...	3'3		Beds ...	2'8		Northants ...	1'13	
Sussex ...	3'3		Bucks ...	2'78		Notts ...	1'13	
Wilts ...	3'3	25	Oxon ...	2'746	100	Staffs ...	1'15	25
Warwick ...	3'2					Essex ...	1'12	
						Kent ...	1'16	
Devon ...	3'145	50			100	Worcester ...	1'17	25
Hunts ...	3'0					Gloucester ...	1'22	
Notts ...	2'8					Berks ...	1'23	
Beds ...	2'8	100						{ 50
Salop ...	2'8					Hereford ...	1'41	
Bucks ...	2'78					Hants ...	1'43	
Oxon ...	2'74	150				Lincs ...	1'6	100
Worcester ...	2'4					Sussex ...	1'6	
Gloucester ...	2'2	180				Leicester ...	[2'5]	200
Hereford ...	2'1							
								550
Population=251,485 Teams=70,606 Mean=3'56 New mean=445 (Mean × 125)			Population=155,512 Teams=43,932 Mean=3'54 New mean=442½ (Mean × 125)			Hides, 54,000 Gheld, 47,628 florins Mean=1'134 Comparative or new mean=453½ (obtained by 400 × 1'134)		
	Entries. % line			Entries. % line			Entries. % line	
	100 in 255			100 in 230			100 in 550	
	93½ " 180			95 " 130			96½ " 200	
	86½ " 150			85½ " 100			76½ " 100	
	73½ " 100			54½ " 50			70 " 50	
	43½ " 50			28½ " 25			33½ " 25	
	30 " 25							



Valets by Valuits (20 Counties).		Teamlands by Teams (21 Counties.)		Population by Teamlands (21 Counties).	
Leicester ...	1'50	Notts ...	'63	Lincs ...	5'0
Warwick ...	1'425	Derby ...	'88		
Northants ...	1'31	Surrey ...	1'02	Notts ...	4'4
Kent ...	1'30	Oxon ...	1'069	Derby ...	3'96
Essex ...	1'17	Lincs ...	1'07	Surrey ...	3'7
Oxon ...	1'16	Hants ...	1'08	Hants ...	3'643
Devon ...	1'106	Beds ...	1'13	Middlesex ...	3'46
Surrey ...	1'07	Warwick ...	1'13	Dorset ...	3'39
Dorset ...	1'04	Bucks ...	1'14		
Bucks ...	1'02	Wilts ...	1'15	Cambs ...	3'10
Berks ...	1'002	Hunts ...	1'15	Berks ...	3'0
Gloucester ...	'99	Berks ...	1'16	Wilts ...	2'9
Hunts ...	'96	Cambs ...	1'16	Northants ...	2'88
Sussex ...	'94	Middlesex ...	1'21	Herts ...	2'87
Worcester ...	'935	Northants ...	1'21	Warwick ...	2'84
Cornwall ...	'908	Herts ...	1'22		
Herts ...	'81	Somerset ...	1'27	Somerset ...	2'83
Beds ...	'74	Dorset ...	1'30	Hunts ...	2'602
Derby ...	'73	Devon ...	1'43	Oxon ...	2'5
Middlesex ...	'628	Staffs ...	1'47	Beds ...	2'48
		Cornwall ...	2'0	Bucks ...	2'41
				Staffs ...	2'2
				Cornwall ...	2'2
				Devon ...	2'1

  

Valets = 41,159 li. Valuits = 38,652 li. Mean = 1'0647 New mean = 447 (i.e., mean $\times$ 420)		Teamlands = 52,354 Teams = 43,932 Mean = 1'192 New mean = 441 (Mean $\times$ 370)		Teamlands = 52,354 Population = 155,512 Mean = 2'97 New mean = 445½ (Mean $\times$ 150)	
Entries. % line 100 in 200 85 ,, 150 65 ,, 100 45 ,, 50 20 ,, 25	Entries. % line 100 in 300 95 ,, 205 81 ,, 100 71½ ,, 50 47½ ,, 25	Entries. % line 100 in 300 95 ,, 230 90 ,, 150 62 ,, 100 33½ ,, 50 33½ ,, 25			

Other  
classes.

between the villans and servi; that the ancillæ (most frequent in the W. Midlands) are regarded as female slaves; that the burgesses as a class are incompletely returned, that the censarii were a small class of free rent-paying tenants, and that the porcarii\* and bovarii\* may be considered both as servile herds, and free farmers of swine and oxen.

Turning to the relationship to one another of the figures in the Main Statistical Table, it is

(pedigrees) in co. Herts (Earle's Land Charters), the *coliberti* and *huri* being not (I believe) found in either place: Ellis adds these 2 (latter) classes at 920, and references to 891 may be found in D. B. 38*a* and *b*, 39*a* and *b*, 41*a*, 44*a*, 57*b*, 58*a*, 64*b*, 65*a*, 66*a* and *b*, 67*a* and *b*, 68*a*, 71*a*, 75*a*, 77*b*, 86*a* and *b*, 87*a* and *b*, 90*a*, 91*a*, 96*b*, 101*a*, 103*b*, 120*a*, 149*a*, 154*a*, 163*a* and *b*, 164*a* and *b*, 165*a*, 166*a*, 174*b*, 179*b*, 181*b*, 182*a* and *b*, 239*b*, 254*a*, 260*a*, in 86 entries only (and to 19 coliberts of 1065 on 38*a* and 163*a*); of these 552 occur on royal manors in 48 entries, 311 on church ones in 32, and but 28 on 6 lay estates. The A.S. *Rectitudines* (10th or 11th cent.) describe the gebur as on a thane's manor, and there seems small room to doubt his correspondence with the villein of D. B. (see note, pp. 147-9); the above shows that the *coliberti* (tho' numerous) were not a widely spread class, and scarcely to be found on lay estates. They seem to have as many or more oxen than the villans [38*a*, 163*a* (*bis*), 164*b*]; on fo. 38*b* six hold 1 Hide; they sometimes pay rent or produce [38*a* and *b*, 39*a*, 165*a*, 174*b* (*bis*), 179*b* (*bis*)], and on the Estates of Westminster Abbey (174*b*), 6 coliberti sow 12 ac., and render 11s. 2d., whereas 8 villans and 10 bordars sow 4 ac., and 10 vill., and 10 bord., 6 ac.; altogether their position as a class is of much uncertainty—they do not occur where *Censarii* are found, save in Dorset (Ellis).

Geburi as  
villani.

Porcarii  
and  
Bovarii.

\* The *porcarii* seem to have been the higher class and sometimes pay a rent in pigs; the *bovarii* often appear to replace the *servi* on the demesnes of Cheshire and Salop Manors, where they were presumably unfree ploughmen; a *liber bovarius* occurs on 183*a*.

obvious that 28 separate divisions might be constructed; of which 15 are set forth in the three following comparative accounts; no extreme mathematical accuracy being postulated in a matter where rough correctness is all that at present can be looked for. In the first table it will be noted that the comparison of like items gives satisfactory results; thus the hides of 1065 seem distinctly the antecessors of those which furnished the ghelds of the middle of the twelfth century, and the valuits of 1065 differ not widely from the valets of 1086, bearing in mind the absence of Yorks in the former class, and of most of the carucated counties in the latter. In these (Derby, Leicester, Lincs, Norfolk, Notts, Rutland, Suffolk, Yorks, and part of Cheshire) greater changes occurred than in hidated England, which the tables do not adequately set forth; nor are the wasted Yorkshire manors to be discovered in the comparison of Teamlands with Teams, the incompleteness of which table gives it a better appearance than it otherwise would have. In a country ploughed up to the maximum an excess of teams over teamlands would be expected, for the reason instanced above; according to the witness of D. B. the majority of counties had surplus arable.\* It seems that no definite amount of land was in view by the expression of land to one team, which would indicate different quantities respectively on the demesne and villenage; the distinction is often made, and the difference should not be overlooked, for on the land of the lord the land of one plough would include the assistance of the tenant, and on the

Remarks  
on Com-  
parative  
Table I.

Land to  
one team.

---

\* That is more teams, could have been used with advantage.

Difference  
of team-  
land, of  
demesne,  
and  
villeinage.

land of the villein the assistance rendered by the plough there was land to, must be subtracted in an areal estimate. Putting aside the probability that the tenant in villeinage worked his own land usually with less than 8 oxen, and taking D. B.'s view of a full team, suppose the demesne plough could till  $x$  acres per ann., and that the team of the men (8 oxen) could work  $a + b$  acres (where  $x = a + b$ ); then  $x + a$  would be the land of one plough on the demesne; and  $(a + b) - a$  on the arable set to the villeins. This I believe was in the minds of the men of the hundreds when they state there could be so many more ploughs on the demesne and villeinage respectively; the matter would not stand exactly as above in actual practice where the occurrence of smaller ploughs of the men, would disturb the balance. Clearly a plough of 4 oxen\* would do far more than half the tillage of one of 8, and one of 2 beasts more than a quarter of it (smaller and lighter implements are predicated); however, when in the returns, mention is made of land to 2, 3, 4 or more oxen, an artificial and roughly proportional comparison may be all that was in view, rather than details of practice, e.g., land to 2 oxen may mean about half the amount of land to 4 oxen, though the varying quantities of demesne and villeinage would further complicate each case. No frequenter of the towing-path would ever be likely to suppose

Oxen per  
plough in  
Wales,  
t. Hen. II.

\* Probably common enough on *villein* lands; cf. *Gerald de Barri* (t. Hen. II.) who states that the Welsh yoke 4 oxen in a plough more often than two: *Wm. de Malmesbury* (t. Hen. I.), writing of Wm. II., and Anselm, states, *Vt aratrum sanctæ ecclesiæ, quod in Anglia duo boves validi & pari fortitudine ad bonum certantes, id est, rex et archiepiscopus Cantuariensis debeant trahere nunc oxe vetula cum tauro indomito iugata.*

# Domesday Statistics

19

COMPARATIVE TABLE NO. II.

Acres by Population (30 Counties).			Acres by Teams (30 Counties).			Valuits by Hides (20 Counties).			
200			200			820			
Norfolk ...	...	48	Oxon ...	...	196	{ 200 170	Kent ...	3'23	600
Essex ...	...	61	Gloucester ...	...	211		Devon ...	2'60	300
Lincs ...	...	66	Hereford ...	...	216	100	Cornwall	1'826	200
100			Beds ...	...	218		Herts ...	1'80	50
Oxon ...	...	71				50	Essex ...	1'54	{ 100 50
Berks ...	...	73	Hunts ...	...	241		Beds ...	1'23	
Northants ...	...	75	Bucks ...	...	243	50	Hunts ...	1'20	250
Somerset ...	...	75	Essex ...	...	251		Gloucester	1'19	
50			Worcester ...	...	254	25	Oxon ...	1'156	100
Beds ...	...	78	Berks ...	...	257		Dorset	1'12	
Middlesex ...	...	78	Northants ...	...	264	25	Middlesex	1'05	400
Leicester ...	...	78	Norfolk ...	...	270		Northants	1'04	
Kent ...	...	79	Notts ...	...	271	25	Sussex ...	1'0	100
Hunts ...	...	80	Somerset ...	...	274		Berks ...	'96	
Dorset ...	...	80				50	Derby ...	'93	400
Herts ...	...	82	Warwick ...	...	288		Worcester	'89	
25			Herts ...	...	289	25	Bucks ...	'86	400
Wilts ...	...	86	Leicester ...	...	291		Surrey ...	'77	
Bucks ...	...	87				100	Warwick	'71	400
Warwick ...	...	88	Wilts ...	...	293		Leicester	'196	
Sussex ...	...	89	Devon ...	...	300				400
25			Sussex ...	...	301				
Notts ...	...	94	Kent ...	...	314				400
Gloucester ...	...	95							
Devon ...	...	95	Middlesex ...	...	331				400
50			Dorset ...	...	358				
Hunts ...	...	100	Lincs ...	...	359				400
Hereford ...	...	100	Cambs ...	...	380				
75			Hants ...	...	397				400
Worcester ...	...	103	Surrey ...	...	403				
Cambs ...	...	105							400
Surrey ...	...	105	Salop ...	...	489				
{ 100 200			Cornwall ...	...	731				400
Cornwall ...	...	159	Derby ...	...	762				
Salop ...	...	169	Staffs ...	...	788				400
415									
Derby ...	...	216							400
645									
Staffs ...	...	235							400
740									
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400
									400

## COMPARATIVE TAB

Teams by Hides (30 Counties.)		Teams by Valets (23 Counties.)		Valets by Hides (22 Counties.)		Teamlands by Hides (21 Counties.)	
Surrey ... '6	300	Kent ... '6	200	Cornwall 4'27	965	Cornwall 15'3	4
Middlesex '6		Dorset ... '66		Kent ... 4'208	950	Devon ... 7'1	1
Berks ... '73	200	Middlesex '72		Devon ... 2'87	510	Staffs ... 2'8	
Leicester '726		Berks ... '75		Essex ... 1'80	200	Notts ... 2'21	
Wilts ... '74		Surrey ... '75		Norfolk 1'71	300	Northants 2'16	
Dorset ... '8		Oxon ... '76		Herts ... 1'47	100	Warwick 1'70	
Sussex ... '9		Essex ... '82		Somerset 1'41		Somerset 1'63	
Bucks ... '9		Herts ... '91		Northants 1'358		Herts ... 1'63	
Hants ... 1'010		Somerset '91		Oxon ... 1'34		Hunts ... 1'5	
Oxon ... 1'023	100	Sussex ... 1'07		Gloucester 1'18	100	Cambs ... 1'36	
Lincs ... 1'1		Bucks ... 1'10		Dorset ... 1'14		Beds ... 1'30	
Beds ... 1'1		Hunts ... 1'10		Staffs ... 1'03	100	Lincs ... 1'20	
Derby ... 1'3		Norfolk 1'12		Warwick 1'01		Derby ... 1'12	
Cambs ... 1'2		Beds ... 1'3		Berks ... '96	200	Hants ... 1'10	
Herts ... 1'3		Gloucester 1'3		Sussex ... '93	300	Oxon ... 1'09	
Hunts ... 1'3		Northants 1'3		Beds ... '91		Bucks ... 1'08	
Somerset 1'3		Devon ... 1'4		Bucks ... '87		Dorset ... 1'0	
Salop ... 1'4		Warwick 1'5		Middlesex '86		Wilts ... '85	
Essex ... 1'5		Staffs ... 1'8		Surrey ... '83	400	Berks ... '84	
Warwick 1'5		Cornwall 1'8		Worcester '82	610	Middlesex '76	
Gloucester 1'6		Worcester 1'9		Derby ... '67		Surrey ... '64	
Worcester 1'6	100	Derby ... 1'9					
Northants 1'8		Leicester 2'5					
Hereford 1'9	200						
Staffs ... 1'9							
Norfolk 2'0	300						
Kent ... 2'5	445½						
Notts ... 3'7	820	Teams = 52,615		Hides = 36,412		Teamlands = 52,35	
Devon ... 5'0		Valets = 49,991½		Valets = 49,255½		Hides = 35,691	
Cornwall 7'7	1,250	Mean = 1'05		Mean = 1'352		Mean = 1'467	
	2,200	New mean = 441		New mean = 446		New mean = 440	
		(Mean × 420)		(Mean × 330)		(Mean × 300)	
Teams :	Entries.	Entries.	Entries.	Entries.	Entries.	Entries.	
70,606	% line	% line	% line	% line	% line	% line	
Hides :	100 in 2,200	100 in 610	100 in 965	100 in 965	100 in 4,200	100 in 4,200	
c. 54,000	96½ „ 1,250	95½ „ 400	95½ „ 950	95½ „ 950	95 „ 1,800	95 „ 1,800	
Mean :	93½ „ 820	78½ „ 200	91 „ 510	91 „ 510	90 „ 400	90 „ 400	
1'31	90 „ 445½	30½ „ 100	86½ „ 227	86½ „ 227	85½ „ 300	85½ „ 300	
New mean :	75½ „ 200		81½ „ 200	81½ „ 200	66½ „ 200	66½ „ 200	
445½	43½ „ 100		31½ „ 100	31½ „ 100	33½ „ 100	33½ „ 100	
(Mean					14½ „ 50	14½ „ 50	
× 340)							

# Domesday Statistics

21

## III.

Acres by Hides (34 Counties.)		Population by Hides (30 Counties.)		Teams by Danegeld (30 Counties.)	
250		220		250	
...	187	Surrey ...	2'39	Surrey ...	'635
...	199	Wilts ...	2'51	Middlesex ...	'64
lesex ...	208			200 Dorset ...	'71
ster ...	213	Berks ...	2'6	Wilts ...	'769
...	217	Bucks ...	2'6		
200		Middlesex ...	2'7	Berks ...	'87
...	231	Leicester ...	2'7	Bucks ...	'95
y ...	252	Sussex ...	3'0	Oxon ...	'988
...	254	Oxon ...	3'1		
x ...	268	Beds ...	3'3	100 Beds ...	1'236
t ...	272	Dorset ...	3'4	Cambs ...	1'257
s ...	313	Gloucester ...	3'5	Herts ...	1'277
100				Hunts ...	1'356
ester ...	336	Worcester ...	3'9	Somerset ...	1'371
rset ...	354	Hants ...	4'0	Hants ...	1'414
...	369	Hunts ...	4'0	Sussex ...	1'424
...	385	Hereford ...	4'1	Norfolk ...	1'470
...	385	Salop ...	4'1	Salop ...	1'489
k ...	395	Cambs ...	4'2	Warwick ...	1'557
...	401	Derby ...	4'5	Essex ...	1'658
ester ...	404	Somerset ...	4'7	Lincs ...	1'772
...	405	Herts ...	4'7		
ord ...	407	Warwick ...	5'0	100 Leicester ...	1'817
ick ...	433			Worcester ...	1'864
s ...	449	Lincs ...	6'0	Gloucester ...	1'941
ants ...	471	Essex ...	6'1	Northants ...	2'024
500		Northants ...	6'2	Staffs ...	2'108
lk ...	543	Staffs ...	6'4		
{ 200				200 Derby } ... { 2'545	{ 200
{ 300		Kent ...	10'0	Notts } ... { 2'545	
...	692	Notts ...	10'0	Hereford ...	2'643
...	797	Norfolk ...	11'2		
500		Devon ...	15'6	610 Kent ...	2'932
...	953	Cornwall ...	35'1	1,040 Cornwall ...	5'23
...	961			2,950 Devon ...	5'329
r ...	1,278				
...	1,490				
...	1,493				
1,000					
...	2,629				
id ...	2,629				
3,000					
all ...	5,601				
5,750					
Entries.		Entries.		Entries.	
% line		% line		% line	
27,506,622	100 in 5,750	Population=251,485	100 in 2,950	Teams=70,606	100 in 1,160
c. 67,000	88 ,, 1,000	Hides=c. 54,000	96 1/2 ,, 1,040	Danegeld=47,628	96 1/2 ,, 1,140
470	80 ,, 500	Mean=4'657	93 3/4 ,, 610	Mean=1'4824	93 3/4 ,, 460
Mean=451	73 1/2 ,, 250	New mean=442 1/2	83 3/4 ,, 220	New mean=444 1/2	90 ,, 445
n x 1 1/2	60 ,, 200	(Mean x 95)	76 3/4 ,, 200	(Mean x 300)	80 ,, 250
	38 ,, 100		33 1/2 ,, 100		66 1/2 ,, 200
					36 3/4 ,, 100

Teams of  
less than  
8 oxen.

that eight men rowing in a "best" boat would be able to cover the Putney-Mortlake course in half the time of a single sculler; to a lesser degree this applies to tillage. Cott. Jul. A (eleventh century) gives a pictorial sketch of 2 ploughmen, 1 plough, 4 oxen; the Utrecht Psalter and Harl. 603 two of A.S. tillage, both showing 1 man, 1 plough, 2 oxen; Cott. Tib. B. V. (eleventh century) 2 men, 1 plough, 4 oxen; the Bayeux Tapestry 2 men, 1 plough, 1 beast; the Royal MS. (thirteenth century) 1 man, 1 plough, 2 oxen; the Chron. Roff. and Loutrell Psalter (both fourteenth century) respectively 1 man, 1 plough, 2 oxen; and 2 men, 1 plough, and 4 oxen: most of these are to be found in books, viz., Larking's D. B. of Kent; Utrecht Psalter; Bayeux Tapestry, and Green's Hist. Eng. (illustrated edition). Nevertheless it seems equally certain that in England the normal demesne plough consisted of the holder and driver, 8 oxen (or 8 animals partly oxen and partly horses), and 1 implement; not necessarily proving the absence of a lighter plough worked by less oxen on the land of the lord, for some occasions. The ploughs of the tenantry seem usually to have consisted of 8 oxen (as joined) when at work on the demesne; the above illustrations indicate this not to have been the custom for working land in villenage, and I know no MS. evidence to the contrary.

Teams of  
8 oxen.

Notably in Cornwall, the teamlands vary much from the teams, the correct explanation (alternate husbandry\*) of which is noted by Professor Mait-

\* D. B. 9a, pasture whence they ploughed 9 ac.; 80b, was pasture, now sowable.



land ; where portion of what is estimated as arable is in grass, plainly less aration is demanded than on a 2 or 3 course shift. As a rule, (1) wheat, (2) barley and oats, (3) bare fallow would seem to have been the rotation ; or a shift of (1) wheat, barley, oats, (2) bare fallow ; and though there is no great amount of precise evidence, the comparison of Teamlands and Teams on the whole support the above. Rotations.

To bring the fifteen tables into fair comparison the following method has been used ; in each table find a mean, and multiply same by a variable figure to produce a new mean, in such a way that the new means of each of the fifteen tables will be nearly alike ; the new mean is then used for the construction of the comparative lines, the results from which are appended in percentages. Thus taking population by teams in 30 counties (Comparative Table I.) the mean is 3·56 (Population by Teams) ; the new mean is most conveniently taken as between 440 and 450 ; and therefore the old mean 3·56 is multiplied by 125, product being 445. To 445, additions and subtractions of 25, 50, 100, 150, 180, and 255 have been made ; the results of which are now divided by the former multiplier (125), enabling lines of 25, 50, etc., to be drawn in the actual table as shown ; with the needful variations this convention has been used in all the fifteen tables, in order to discover their relative superiority. Method of  
Tables.

The first table plainly shows that to state that William the Conqueror made the land to be assessed on an entirely fresh set of units, or that he

Population  
varies as  
Teams.

so devastated the whole country that the value was greatly reduced twenty years after his landing, would not be supported by evidence, for the hides and valuits of 1065 roughly answer to those of *circa* 1150 and 1086 respectively in the comparisons as made; setting aside the comparison of like with like, the only table really satisfactory is that of Population by Teams, where (as should be expected) a clear relation is established.

Slender  
results  
from other  
*unlike*  
Factors.

Except in the first table (5 divisions), the comparisons are slender; the remaining 10 divisions appear in Tables II. (3 divisions) and III. (7 divisions); the tables having been grouped by comparative results: Density (Table II.) gives the best yield, and the supposed relationship (1085) of Hides, Teams, Values, and *Valuits* (1065) is demonstrated to have but slight grounds of support, for plainly the results from these items will not compare with the very artificial one of Acres by Recorded Population. In a country like England, both of 1085 and 1900, there can be no very near kinship between the acres and population county for county, as plainly the flat agricultural districts will be more densely inhabited than the hills and moors; hence *a fortiori* as to the remaining 9 divisions which yield an inferior result. The areas of counties in Maitland's *D. B. and Beyond* are from the Agricultural Returns, 1895, and his results from them used here, though the figures in the Main Statistical Table in this book are from the Census Table, 1891—the difference is not great.

## CHAPTER II

### FEUDAL STATISTICS

“Eodem anno rex Angliæ pater transfretauit de Normannia in Angliam, & apud Wodestocke fecit *Gaufridum* filium suum, Comitem Brittanniæ, militem: qui statim post susceptionem militaris officii, transfretauit de Anglia in Normanniā, & in confinibus Franciæ & Normanniæ militaribus exercitiis operam præstans gaudebat se bonis militibus æquiparari & eo magis ac magis probitatis suæ gloriam quæsiuit, quo fratres suos, *Henricum* videlicet regem, & *Richardum* Comitem Pictaviæ in armis militaribus plus florere cognouit. Et erat eis mens vna, videlicet, plus cæteris posse in armis: scientes, quod ars bellandi, si non præluditur, cum fuerit necessaria non habetur. Nec potest athleta magnos spiritus ad certamen afferre, qui nunquam suggilatus est. Ille qui sanguinē suum vidit; cuius dentes crepuerunt sub pugno; ille qui supplantatus aduersarium toto tulit corpore, nec proiecit animum proiectus; qui quotiens cecidit, contumacior surrexit, cum magna spe descēdit ad pugnam. *Multum enim adiicit sibi virtus lacessita; fugitiua gloria est mens subiecta terrori. Sine culpa vincitur oneris immensitate, qui ad portandam sarcinam impar, tamen deuotus occurrit. Bene soluuntur sudoris præmia, ubi sunt templa Victoriæ.*”

[A.D. 1178; Rogeri de Hoveden\* Annalivm,  
curâ H. Sauile.]

---

\* Rog. de Houeden — Justice Itinerant, A.D., 1189-90;  
1 Ric. I., Rot. Pip.

A.S.  
Charters.

IN Saxon† charters from the 7th century onwards grants are made as the land of so many manentes, cassati, tributarii, and the terms mansæ, mansiunculæ, hida londe, sulungs occur as well as ploughlands, yoklets, and acres, some avowedly and others presumably by way of estimation: plainly not all equating each other, tho' some of them synonymous. Now it so happens that sometimes the numerical estimate agrees with that of Domesday; for example before 988 Woldham came to the Bishop of Rochester for 6 Sulungs (Reg. Roff.) which estimate is repeated 1086 (D. B. s.v. Oldham); in 948 Edred restored to the church at Winchester 100 mansæ at Downton and Ebbesburn (K. 421) which by Domesday was 100 Hides in the time of Cnut, and the same less 3 in 1065 (fo. 65a). Edgar in 972 (K\* 570) granted to Pershore perpetual freedom in their choice of abbot, in which deed upwards of 300 mansæ in Glos'ter and Worcester are named, and tho' in 1086 the Abbot had not actual possession, he had rights over a similar number of Hides (D. B.); in 725 Ine granted 12 manentes to Glastonbury in Sowe (K\* 74) which had 12 Hides in 1086; in 984 Ethelred's charter to the nuns of Shaftesbury names "twen tiwe hiwe at tissebiri," where a like number 1086; in 998 (Reg. Roff.) are some 6 Sulungs at Bromley (with further estate in Andrede's Wood) by measure, and in 1086, ten teamlands and 6 Sulungs at the former place, and should any dislike of the above by reason of their

{ Norman }  
{ Charters. }

† In Norman charters, the land of a plough (*caruca*), frequently; no indication of a *carucata ad gheldum* (Ord. Vit.): the term Saxon is loosely used for the people of England (from whatever source deriving), before the advent of Duke William.

scantiness and dates, reference to the paper on the Præ-Domesday Hide of Glos'ter by the editor of the Journal of the Bristol etc. Arch. Soc. should give full satisfaction for that county. Not that it is meant to say that all the land in Domesday, or any considerable portion thereof, can be accounted for in A.S. Charters, but that in so hard a comparison there are striking instances of similarity; not much do these deeds tell of actual Husbandry, but Seebohm (p. 139 *Eng. Vill. Comm.*) cites Abba's Will A.D. 835 (K. 235) in support of the 120 acre theory, which said testator bequeaths a  $\frac{1}{2}$  Sulung with 4 oxen, 2 cows, and 50 sheep thereto, but as may be discovered from Domesday Sulings were fiscal as well as areal units, and should this half one mean 60 acres, at least 20 in grass would be wanted for the support of the stock named. Again teamlands in A.S. deeds were (at any rate some times) of estimate; thus A.D. 774 (K. 121) "et huius terræ estimatio v. aratorum" and A.D. 738 (K. 85) "id est decem aratorum iuxta æstimationem prouinciæ eiusdem"; further A.D. 1016-1020 (K. 732) in Godwin's marriage contract "on Búrwaremarse other half 100 acres and thereto 30 oxen, and 20 cows and 10 horses, and ten theowmen" and on fo. 12b (D. B.) under Burwarmaresc, the lands is 12 pls., 4 in demesne, and 44 villans with 5 bordars have 10 pls., which is not disagreeable (*i.e.* 4 dem. pls.) to the above, and also Add. Ch. 19,796 in the Abbot of Evesham's lease of A.D. 1017-1023, for 3 lives of 3 Hides to inware and other half to outware, but 1 man, 6 oxen, 20 sheep, and 20 acres sown to corn are to revert to the Minster on the termination of the agreement for Norton, which

plainly shows the Hide not necessarily entirely arable, as is frequently supposed. In a grant of A.D. 812 by Cenwulf King of the Mercians (K. 199) occur "mediam partem unius mansiunculæ id est an ioclet" and "hoc est terræ particula duarum manentium id est an sulung," suggesting

1 mansiunculus = 2 yoklets  
1 sulung = 2 manentes

or perhaps that the mansiunculus and manens here equate the yoklet and suling respectively. The Burghal and County Hidages are set forth in Prof. Maitland's *D.B. and Beyond*, and the Tribal Hidage therein named is here given, from Earle's *Land Charters* which dates the Saxon writing as of the 10th or 11th century.

Heptarchic HIDAGE OF PART OF ENGLAND AT THE TIME OF THE  
Hides. HEPTARCHY.

1. Myrcna landes .. 30,000	20. Hwinca .. .. 7,000
2. Wocen sætna .. 7,000	21. Cilteln sætna .. 4,000
3. Westerna .. .. 7,000	22. Hendrica .. .. 3,500
4. Pecsætna .. .. 1,200	23. Unecungga .. .. 1,200
5. Elmed sætna .. 600	24. Avo Sætna .. .. 600
6. Lindes farona, with Hæthfeldlande .. 7,000	25. Færthinga .. .. 300
7. Suth Gyrwa .. .. 600	26. Bilmiga .. .. 600
8. North Gyrwa .. 600	27. Widerigga .. .. 600
9. East Wixna .. .. 300	28. East willa .. .. 600
10. West Wixna .. .. 600	29. West willa .. .. 600
11. Spalda .. .. 600	30. East engle .. .. 30,000
12. Wigesta .. .. 900	31. East Sexena .. 7,000
13. Herefinna .. .. 1,200	32. Cant Warena .. 15,000
14. Sweordora .. .. 300	33. Suth Sexena .. 7,000
15. Gifla .. .. 300	34. West Sexena .. 100,000
16. Hicca .. .. 300	Two Hundred Thousand and
17. Wiht Gara .. .. 600	Two and Forty Thousand
18. Nox Gaga .. .. 5,000	Hides and Seven Hundred
19. Oht Gaga .. .. 2,000	Hides (242,700)
That is, 66,100 Hides	

Why this early estimate is to be regarded as mere exaggeration I am entirely at a loss to discern,

for (for aught I can find) England might well have had a population of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions at the time of the Heptarchy, which would be answerable to the quantities in the table: for the ancient meaning of the word Hide (see King Alfred's trans. of Bede) would seem to be the land of one family, hence a population of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions or a little less might correspond to 250,000 families (bearing in mind that the table presumably falls far short of the 40 modern English counties); for example Bede names the Isle of Wight as the land of 1,200 families, and the recorded population of 1086 is 1,124 by Ellis' cast. True it is that in 1065 the Hide is a fiscal unit, which is not to say that it at no time had been closely allied with reality, nor, because this artificial Hide of D. B. is computed at 120 fiscal acres, is it to be therefore imagined that each head of a family in Heptarchic days had that amount of arable. For I would suppose that never in the History of England could  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the heads of families have been masters of so many ploughed acres with suitable rights of wood, pasture and meadow for the extremely simple reason that 5 men would be but a scanty allowance for the working of such a tenement (by theory 2 men would be ploughing the greater part of the year, and if two 4 ox teams were used 4 of them). And plain it seems to be that this vision of fraternal harmony (at the rate of 120 acres of arable) would necessitate an overwhelming majority of the population in a dependent condition; that is to say, as labourers not necessarily servile, but under conditions of subjection as employed persons. This of course does not include such a supposed stipulation

120 statute  
acres  
arable, *not*  
the land of  
one family.

as but 30 of the 120 acres annually under the plough, as that would correctly be at the rate  $\frac{120}{4}$  arable acres, but comprehends that of a 2 course shift, *i.e.*, 120 acres ploughed, half in bare fallow.

As I understand the theory of the "free ceorls"\*

Owners of  
land  
T.R.E.,  
and  
T.R.W.

\* The government Domesday Indexes (Ellis) enable the postulate that the A.S. "landowners" of 1065 were considerably more numerous than the *tenants in capite* and *mesne lords* (9,000-10,000) of 1086; but the method of the præ-Domesday List of proprietors allows no exactitude of statement; under the heading of *Liberi Homines*, Thaners, Sokemen, *Homines*, *Fratres*, Burgesses, and Radknights, 6,000-7,000 are enumerated, and the remainder (personal names) might well furnish the balance for a total 20,000. It may however be observed that a principle of selection, not easy to discover, has been applied to the Sokemen and *Liberi Homines* of 1065 (who account for some  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the above 6,000-7,000), and as in 1086 these are practically excluded (in the 9,000-10,000 total), it is better to omit them, leaving 9,271 mediate and immediate tenants at that date, against approximately 13,000 "landowners" in 1065, and a rough equation of  $\frac{A.S.}{A.N.} = \frac{3}{2}$ .

Certain it is that many of the A.S. landowners had considerable estates, as the following examples (all of the Wapentake of Claro, Yorks), collated with the Indexes in the Yorks Arch. and Top. Translation of Domesday, demonstrate; save where stated all were lords of seemingly whole Manors, presumably had no other estate enumerated, and were above the rank of the so-called *free ceorls*:

	Hidage.	Land to	1065 Value.	Place.
Claman .. ..	1 car.	$\frac{1}{2}$ plough	5s.	Arkendale
Dolphin .. ..	$\frac{1}{2}$ "	..	"	Aldfield
Earne .. ..	2 "	1 plough	20s.	Neusone
Elflet, lord of $\frac{1}{4}$ Manor	$\frac{1}{2}$ "	$\frac{1}{2}$ "	2s. 6d.	Castley
Esnebern .. ..	7 bovates	$\frac{1}{2}$ "	10s.	Stollai
Ram .. ..	$1\frac{1}{2}$ car.	$\frac{3}{8}$ "	16s.	Useburne
Suneman .. ..	$1\frac{1}{2}$ "	1 "	10s.	Grafton
Turgrim, lord of $\frac{2}{3}$ Manor .. ..	$\frac{4}{5}$ "	$\frac{3}{5}$ "	6s.	Alureton

There



they were lords as above, which hypothesis is incompatible with the non-subjection of the majority of the rest of the population to said small owners, and hence contains in itself the elements of its own destruction; tho' of course a nation of such proprietors might exist as an aristocracy of yeomen, and a democracy of farm-labourers in proper proportions. But the postulate seems rather to be that some half of the heads of families were peasant proprietors with such relatively enormous holdings as to be quite impracticable on the given conditions; whether or not this pleasing but unreal picture has had its originals in the congested atmosphere of our own fountains of learning, or was imported already constructed from across the ocean is beyond our power to discern, but so great an oddity is there in the appearance thereof, as to deny any kinship with the open air of the fields.

Modern theories of Ancient Land-ownership impracticable.

The Hide appears in the Heptarchic memorandum already cited, in the laws of Ine before A.D. 694, in the endorsement of Nunna's grant (K. 1000), in A.D. 725 at the end of Wiglaf's

There were some 15,000-18,000 *places* in the counties recorded in D. B. 1086, and possibly *Manors* somewhat corresponding, giving each of the former an average population of about 100: in 1315-16 the *vills* fall far short of this number, but no statistical results can be drawn from these returns of 9 Ed. II., owing to deficiencies and lack of uniformity; thus, in Yorks there are about the same no. of *vills*, as *places* in 20 Wm. I., but in certain counties the former are less than the no. of *parishes* recorded in 1371, which in all England (save Cheshire) amounted to 8,600, answering to an average of 300 folk, or rather less per parish, as by the Poll Tax of 1377; in 16 Ed. II. (Parl. Writs, vol. ii.) is a classification of *vills*,  $\frac{1}{2}$  *vills*, hamlets, and parts of *vills*.

Places, Manors, Vills, and Parishes, 1086-1377.

The Hide  
and  
Hidage.

grant (K. 237), in A.D. 836 in King Alfred's translation of Bede, and has not disappeared in the 15th cent. (Memoranda L.T.R. Hil. 5 Hen. V. Rot. 18) where is note of an allowance to the Sheriff for Hidage,\* which is named still later in the Parliament Rolls of 20 and 23 Hen. VI., and 7-8 Ed. IV. From a period considerably before the Conquest its main importance seems for purposes of taxation, and presumably also for local rates, which latter usage appears to be maintained as long as the name persists; allowing that in Customals and the Hundred Rolls etc. the Hide is further used as an areal measure for 120 acres or other quantity. The artificial nature of Hidage plainly appears from the Domesday Tables, and in the Pipe Roll passing for 31 Hen. I. are notes of fines (pp. 123 and 125 printed vol.) that the Manors of Burwardescota and Etton shall from that date rate at a presumably lower hidage; Kings Wm. I., Hen. I., and Hen. II. taxed the lands by hides (21 Hen. II. Pipe Roll—I marc allowed for carrying the summonses of Danegeld) and Ric. I. appears to have done so in his 6th year, Somerset yielding £293 18s. 2d., Dorset £241 3s. 9d., and Worcester £99 12s., which at 2s. per Hide practically agree with the Domesday figures. In the Testa de Nevill (p. 295) in an inquisition of King John's, where  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a carucate pays 10d. to Danegeld in Denham, and 6 acres in the same place  $3\frac{1}{2}$ d. (the word here *may* refer to a rate), and carucage was taken temp. John and Hen. III., which in some cases may have been raised by the Hide

\* Quittance from Hidage (as well as Danegeld) may be noted in the Foundation Charter of Battle Abbey, 21 Wm. I.

rather than the plough,\* and in 1222 (St. Paul's Domesday, Camd. Soc.) Hides are continually defended against both King and Sheriff, whilst the jurors of Draitone name exactions made in common by Hides, which supports the view that taxation

\* W. H. Stevenson (writing in the E. H. R., vol. iv., *Carucage*. p. 109) challenges the statement that *Carucage* was ever levied on the plough-team itself (citing A.D. 1220); as the Close Rolls for that year (4 Hen. III., 1220) contain writs (Rot. Cl. i. 437*a* and *b*) to all the Sheriffs of England to levy 2s. on each plough, *as it was joined* on the morrow of the feast of St. John the Baptist last past, it would seem to require that extreme abstraction (so conspicuous a mark of the *ex cathedrâ* writer), to explain the union of *Hides* or *Carucates* on the morrow, etc.: the writ of course refers to the yoking of oxen in the plough-teams, and not to some absolutely meaningless junction of acre to acre at a particular date. The above [E. H. R., vol. iv., p. 109] seems seriously enough written, but merely shows the modern usages of the Schools, whereby the critic can expound what he has either not read, or is incompetent to understand: these writs (Cl. 4 Hen. III.) show that in Northants (and perhaps in all counties) the demesnes of *all clerks* and their rustics were exempted, and that the ploughs of their Knights and free tenants were not to be answered by the collectors in their rolls; Subsidy  $\frac{242}{20}$  (marked *t. Hen. III.* in the official slips, and certainly of the time when Falkes de Breauté was in power) is presumably the return for this county (the best *carucage* known to the writer), stating the exemption of the prelates and their rustics, together with omissions of 9 other fees, honours, etc., and responding for  $2613\frac{1}{4}$  ploughs (possibly from  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the shire), as against 2422 teams in the whole county in 1086 (D. B.), at which date were some 1356 Hides. There are other *carucages* in existence, but usually of little statistical value, omitting mention of exemptions, and parts of the counties otherwise collected; in addition to this there would be the usual mediæval tendency towards assessment rather than enumeration (*vide* writ as above): in 4 Hen. III., Yorks, and Lincs, pay £200 and £40 (the equivalent of 2,000 and 400 ploughs) respectively—figures which can scarcely deceive the most credulous. Mediæval taxation.

Danegeld,  
etc.

of this nature at least had not passed out of mind *t.* Hen. III., whilst rating as already shown continued much longer. Danegeld (exemption from) is named in a Charter to Fountains of 1 Ric. I. (Ex Rot. Chart. 5 Ed. II. per Inspex.) and also in another\* of 11 Ric. I. (pp. 8 and 18 No. 67 Surtees Soc.), and the following from Madox's *Formulare Anglicanum* bear on the matter in hand (p. 238)—concession by Wm. I. of 8 Hides free from Geld; (p. 176) Feoffment or Confirmation of the Manor of Bromham by Wm. II. to Battle Abbey, free from ghelds, scots, hidages, danegelds, shires, hundreds, and armies; (p. 291) grant and confirmation to Battle Abbey by Hen. I. free from all gheld, scot, shires, hundreds, hidage, danegeld, and expedition, and (p. 293) King Stephen quit-claims from ghelds, danegelds, Justices' and Sheriffs' Aid,† "et ab omni exercituum expeditione."

\* In 1251 Hen. III. (*anno* 36) granted lands in England, to Alexander, King of Scotland, free of Danegeld and Hidage (Rot. Parl., i. 115*a*).

Sheriffs'  
Aid.

† This Aid is named in Rot. Parl. (12 Ed. IV., vi. 64) A.D. 1472, the Commons praying discharge of it, amongst certain old payments, when not able to be levied (citing an unobserved ordinance of 5 Ric. II., that all Sheriffs should account, and be discharged by their oaths)—*Le Roy s'advisera*. The Commons state that these "grete Fermes and Sommes under divers olde names axed" (giving details), "the said Shirefes know nat wher ner howe to levye," and the preceding article (vi., 63) respecting riots in Cumberland further illustrates the matter. The management of the King's interest in the county in 1472 would thus seem to have retained much of the form apparent in the published Pipe Rolls of Hen. II., which themselves appeared to be foreshadowed in 1086 (D. B.), in which are divers evidences of

The Domesday Hides amount in number to about 67,000\* in 34 counties, and approximate to same *circa* 1150 (see Tables): a comparison with the Leicestershire Survey 1124-9 is made in *Feudal England* (Round), and another can be done from Gale's Register of the Honour of Richmond for Hang, Gilling, and Halikeld Wapentakes 30 Hen. II. (1183-4), the carucates of which are almost identical with those of the Book of Winton (1086); the reference occurs on pp. 24-6, and on pp. 22-3 presumably of the same date (30 Hen. II.), are fines to the Sheriff computed at 4s. 7d. per Tenmantele, (10 men equal to 14 carucates), and it is curious to observe that taking the Domesday figures as 10,095† (Maitland) the Danegeld would be £165-£166, at the above rate, and that the actual amount named in 31 Hen. I. (Pipe Roll) is £114 os. 4d., *plus* £51 19s. 2d. by pardons. Some further illustrations of the occasional stability of Hides are given later from the H. R. of Ed. I., also comparison of the Survey of St. Paul's Manors (1222) in Essex, Herts, Middlesex and Surrey shows practical identity with 1086, and the appended table collating the Ramsey Abbey Manors

Occasional  
stability of  
Hides.

fiscal administration, thus: *Beds*, 209a (*bis*), 209b (*ter*); *Cambs*, 197a; *Chester*, 262b; *Essex*, ii. 2 (*bis*), and 3; *Hants*, 50a; *Hereford*, 179b; *Norfolk*, ii. 118, 119, and 276 (the royal treasury); *Salop*, 254a; *Surrey*, 30b; *Wilts*, 69a; *Worcester*, 172a.

\* Prof. Maitland's Norfolk "Hidage" has been used here, though not agreeable to the evidence of D. B.

† For Yorks; but land between Tyne and Tees (not in D. B.) is accounted for in 8 Hen. II.

MANORS OF RAMSEY ABBEY IN HUNTS, BEDS, CAMBRIDGE,  
NORTHANTS, AND HERTS 1086, AND TEMP. ED. II.\*Examples  
of con-  
tinuity of  
Hidage.

Hunts.	Normancross Hundred.	
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Athelinton ..	10 H. 4 c.	10 H. 4 c.
Sawtre ..	7 $\frac{3}{8}$ H.	7 $\frac{3}{8}$ H.
Lodinton ..	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.
Weston ..	10 H.	4 c. 15 H.
Brington ..	7 H.	
Bytherne ..	4 H.	
Walton ..	not in	5 H.

Hunts.	Leystonestane Hundred.	
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Giddinge ..	not in	7 H. 1 c.
Ellington ..	9 H.	10 H.
Dillington ..	6 H.	6 H.

Hunts.	Tolesland Hundred.	
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Offorde ..	4 H.	4 H.
E m i n g - forde ..	18 or 19 H.	18 H. 2 c.
E m i n g - forde alia ..	5 or 6 H.	5 H.
Gyllinge ..	5 H.	5 H.

Hunts.	Hyrstington Hundred	
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Stukeley ..	7 H.	7 H.
Ripton Ab. ..	10 H. 2 c.	10 H. 2 c.
Broughton ..	9 H.	9 H. 4 c.
Wistowe ..	9 H. 3 c.	9 H. 2 c.
Haliwelle ..	9 H. 2 c.	9 H. 2 c.
Slepe ..	20 H. 3 c.	20 H. 3 c.
Houghton ..	7 H. 2 c.	7 H. 2 c.
Wilton ..	7 H. 2 c.	7 H. 2 c.
Wardeboys ..	10 H. 3 c.	10 H. 3 c.

Herts.		
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Therfield ..	10 $\frac{1}{4}$ H.	10 H. c.

Bedfordshire.		
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Cranfield ..	10 H.	10 H. 4 c.
Barton ..	11 H.	10 H. 2 c.
Pekesdene ..	10 H.	10 H. 1 c.
Shitlingdon ..	10 H.	10 H. 5 V.
		3 c.
G r a v e n - hurst ..	not in	1 H.
Holewelle ..	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.
Berford ..	5 H.	5 H.
Cliston ..	1 H.	1 H.

Cambridgeshire.		
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Gravele ..	5 H.	5 H. 2 c.
Knapwell ..	5 H.	5 H.
Elsworth ..	9 H. 1 V.	9 H. 1 V.
	5 ac.	5 ac.
Stowe ..	2 H.	{ 3 H. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.
alia Stowe ..		
Broune ..	1 H.	1 H.
Drayton ..	3 $\frac{3}{8}$ H.	1 H.
Overe ..	10 $\frac{3}{4}$ H.	11 H. 2 c.
Girton ..	8 $\frac{3}{8}$ H.	8 $\frac{3}{8}$ H. c.
Borewell ..	10 $\frac{1}{4}$ H.	10 $\frac{1}{2}$ H. c.
Charteriz ..	2 $\frac{7}{8}$ H.	3 H. c.

Northants.		
	1086.	t. Ed. II.
Whiston ..	{ 3 H.	{ 5 H. 1 H.
Doddinton ..		
Hisham ..	not in	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.
Bernevelle ..	6 H.	6 H.
Hemington ..	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ H.	3 H. 3 v.

\* H. = Hide or Hides, V. = Virgate or Virgates, c. = carucate or carucates, and the date of the Survey of the record of Ed. II. is not headed, nor noted in margin, but is in body of text (*Cart. Rams.*, Rolls Series).

t. Ed. II. and Domesday demonstrates the point still further. Records of the reign of Ed. I. frequently show the enquiry whether or not villas are "geldabiles," such contributing to the Sheriff's aid for Hidage, etc.; thus 39 Hen. III. (Salop H. R.) a usual rate is 4d. for *motfey* and the like for streetward per rateable hide (another point of interest in this record is the occasionally double description in terms of the fee and hide); also in Kirkby's Quest (13 Ed. I.) in Staincliffe, Yorks, a common rate is  $3\frac{3}{4}$ d. per carucate to the Wapentake fine (similar in amount to 4s. 7d. per Tenmentale of 14 car.), and in Pontebell, (same co.), no fine is due, because held by acres and not by bovates. Some villas have exemption from these local rates (the lords having regalities, or as being held in alms may quit them), and further instances can be seen from the H. R. (7 Ed. I.) in Wilbraham Parva, Swaffham, Bolebek, and Coteham co. Camb. of defence against the King and Sheriff; of local rates (p. 337, Vol. II., Hoggeston), Hidage at 6d. per virgate; (p. 829, Vol. II., Badigton) Hidage and Frankpledge; (p. 407, V. II.) Pontage raised by the Hide for repair of the bridge over the Cam, and at Elyngton and Gidding co. Hunts (V. II., 7 Ed. I.) the so-called Hidage of the Abbot of Ramsey, presumably to furnish the 40 days' expenses of 4 knights whilst in the King's Service.

As to the areal Hide its variations may be particularly studied in the Ramsey Chartulary (Rolls Series) where at Shitlingdon *c.* 1240 it is computed at 4 virgates of 12 acres each (*i.e.*,

Variations  
of Areal  
Hides.

48 ac.), and at Therfield of 4 virg. of 64 ac. (*i.e.*, 256 ac.) with in other cases 3-7 virg. per Hide; in the H. R. (referring of course to the 5 counties given at large) it is—I think—the exception for Hides to be named, either for defence, or as areal measures, nevertheless there are indications of a varying no. of acres per Hide,\*

\* The E. H. R. (vol. v., p. 143, review by W. H. Stevenson) states that measurements are never given in terms of the Hide and Oxcang, Ploughland and Yardland, as still frequently confused by antiquaries, which proposition postulates that the critic is better informed than Domesday Book; such a statement calls to mind the reply of the unfortunate authoress of the "New Atlantis," who had discovered some special Facts (concerning the Whigs, *t. Anne*) which were thought above her own Intelligence (*i.e.*, information), and alleged in defence that her source was *Inspiration*, "because knowing her own Innocence she could account for it in no other Way." Some of the following references to Domesday demonstrate that the uniformity alleged in the E. H. R. is not agreeable to the Record: *Cheshire* (body of county), 263*a*, 266*a*—bovates occur in a hidated shire; (between Ribble and Mersey), 269*b*, 270*a*—one Hide is equated to 6 Carucates, which is amply borne out by the summary of 79 Hides (scotting), whereas the Hides and Carucates add to about 80 H. by above equation; and further the Hide is sometimes valued at 16s. and the Carucate at 2s. 8d.; *Cornwall*, 123*a* to 125*a* appears to prove the *acre* greater than the *ferling*, and from the *Exon D. B.* the former seems equal to 10 fiscal English acres, thus p. 92, Tretlant 4 ac.; p. 206, Tretlant (apparently same entry), 1 virgate and 1 acre; also p. 242, Delio, 1 virgate divided into 1½ acres and another land, suggesting 4 ferl. = 1 virgate = 3 acres, which is rather supported by the *Testa de Neville* (21 Ed. I., pp. 204-5), where the Cornish acre equals the Cornish carucate; *Devon*, 104*a*, 107*b*, 110*a*, the acre apparently normal, and the ferling the fourth of a virgate; *Glos'ter*, 162*a*, the Welsh carucates; *Hereford*, 181*a* and *b*, 182*b*, English and Welsh Hides; *Kent*,

Domesday  
"measures."

{ Cornish  
"acres." }



and Hides per virgate (at Haliwell, Hunts, a virg. of 16 ac., at Elyngton, Hunts, a Hide of 120 ac. in 5 virg., and at Gidding, Hunts, a Hide of 180 ac. in 6 virg.) and by collating the Ramsey Cartulary with itself and the H. R. it may be seen that in the same place changes occur at different times ; thus at Dillington, Hunts, in 1279 (H. R.) the virgate contains 18 ac., and about 1240 (Ramsey Cart.)  $33\frac{1}{2}$  ac. These Hides have of course no connexion with the amount of land ploughable by one team p. a., and it may be observed both from the Chartulary and the H. R. that certain holdings are "out of Hide," and that the com-

10a, half a solin and 3 virgates, the virgate being the fourth of a jugum (see *Feudal England*, p. 108), and 2a,  $400\frac{1}{2}$  acres make  $2\frac{1}{2}$  solins, which with the entries of the Rochester Custumal (p. 153) of 40 acres per jugum, and the absence of further information in D. B., suggests that the solin might have contained 160 and not 120 fiscal acres ; *Leicester*, 232b, 3 carucates less a virgate ; 236a, 5 car. less 1 virg. ; and 237a, one Hide of 12 or 18 car. la. ; *Norfolk*, vide ii. 168, 205, 224, and 237, as instances of actual or computed measurements, which seem to have been not uncommon here, thus ii. 171,  $\frac{1}{2}$  league and 2 perches long by 4 quarenteens and 4 feet wide (in co. Bucks 145a, one Hide less 5 feet occurs) ; *Northants*, 219b, 222a, 223a and b, 225a (bis), and b (bis), 226b, 227b and 228b afford 11 unmis-

Inter-  
mixture of  
Domesday  
measures."

takeable instances of bovates (oxgangs) added to or subtracted from Hides and Virgates ; *Notts*, 289b, a ferling, seemingly equated to a bovat ; *Rutland*, 293b, 2 Hundreds each of 12 fiscal carucates ; *Salop*, 253a, 255a, Fines of Welsh land, and 260b, a ferling apparently of 10 acres ; *Suffolk*, *passim*, presumptive actual or computed measurements ; *Yorks*, 376b, 2 measurements of Pontefract castellate, and frequently the areas of manors, and the woods contained in same are given, see p. 129, and note on p. 131 for co. Leics.

putation by Hides may differ as whether against the King or the lord (Craunfield, co. Beds., p. 2, V. II., Rolls Series); this together with the changing no. of acres per Hide tends to indicate a possible solution of the great variations noted, on the supposition that the rural arrangements are constructed to fit the fiscal ones. Tho' taxation & rates are paid by the Hide, nevertheless individuals are liable and in defence for varying proportions; the acre is not the unit of assessment and it might well be that an artificial unit such as the Hide should contain in one place twice or more, than the acres in another, with the further fact of usually certain tenements being omitted from the reckoning—as a rule (if I have observed rightly) cottagers are not in defence, and both in the Chartulary and H. R. for the Ramsey Manors a tolerably close approximation of the details with the no. of Hides stated, is to be found, rather than exact coincidence. Further, Hides are to be sought in ground unoccupied and presumably defended by the lord of the Manor, thus D. B. (fo. 204*b*) the 10th Hide wasted for the King's wood (Elin-tune), which same is noted in the Ramsey Chart. (*t.* Hen. I. and *t.* Hen. II.) as being in the wood of Walberge; the Abbot of Croyland's 5 Hides in the Coatham Marshes (1086-1279 compared in the sequel); and at Beolege (D. B., fo. 175*a*) in plain and wood 21 Hides, said wood being 6 leagues by 3, and but 10 ploughs named: also the arable of the lord's demesne is sometimes out of Hide, and not rarely the hidation is given first for the Manor, and then for its components, *i.e.*, demesne

Fiscal  
Hides in  
Woods,  
and  
Marshes.

and villenage. Could we transfet the centuries doubtless a landowner would be able to indicate the exact boundaries of his property, and likewise inform of its total Hides, and indicate exactly by whom each item of taxes and rates was paid—further it might be found that some tenants paid neither rates nor taxes, and others perhaps in proportion to their holdings in the common fields, the owner acquitting the demesne at a more or less arbitrary computation for arable, wood, and grass, by Hides, which may indicate different quantities of ground on 2 adjoining properties. Again either the whole estate may be, say, 10 Hides, or but such portions of it as are concerned in defending them; in Yorkshire (1086) there can be small doubt that wood and rough pasture is within the carucate, as the dimensions of same are often given and comprised within the larger areas of the Manors—see also Kelham's *D. B. Illustrated* (p. 231); “took from this land 1 Hide of the aforesaid wood,” and “ $\frac{1}{2}$  a Hide of wood.” Now tho' it might have been practicable to fix a tax by the acre (instead of the Hide) on arable and grass enclosures, to bring woods and rough pasture land into a similar computation in proportion to their area would be a hard matter, premising that the latter would have to be sought out and measured, and charged at a suitable and varying rate. The scope of the Hide appears to approach to 400 acres in 1086, and its fiscal value then to be 120 ac.; and possibly at that period a rough estimate—equivalent to 10,000,000 acres (made up as of arable, several meadow and pasture, some wood,

Yorkshire  
Manors.

Scope of  
the fiscal  
Hide.

Knights'  
Fees.

Bishop of  
Durham's  
Case,  
Service,  
and  
Retainers.

mills and other sources of profit)—may have been in view. The same conception may be made of the Knight's Fee, either the whole tenement being regarded as X fees, or but certain portions of it which total X ; thus a fief of 10 fees might be made up of 7 of old feoffment and 3 on the "dominicum," or one of 15 fees, of 12 of old, 5 of new feoffment, and the "dominicum" quit, in which latter case there appears an excess of fees. Sure it is, there must ever have been a balance for the lord of the fee ; in the former case the "dominicum" if entirely subinfeuded would be more than 3 fees, tho' only liable for that number ; to take an actual case the Bp. of Durham said he ought (L. R. Rolls Series) the service of 10 knights, and sends in a certificate of about 70 ; he can name any 10 of these as his service to the King, and his entire tenement comprises either 10 or 70 fees,\* the service being dischargeable from but a small portion of his estate. For taking the Bp.'s statement to be correct (and in an ordinary case I do not discover he ever paid on more), he is not bound to enfeoff a tenant who owes him 1 knight's service in  $\frac{1}{10}$  of his estate—that, subject perhaps to custom, is a matter of arrangement between the Bp. and prospective tenant, and an excess of fees above service is easily comprehensible. In 19 Hen. III. (Testa de Nevill, aid to marry), when all tenants paid on both old and new feoffment (theoretically), as conceded by the common council of the realm, the said Bp. (p. 373 T. de N.) pays £200, equal, at 2 marcs per fee, to 150 fees ; but for the Gascony escuage circa 1242 (p. 412 T. de N.) his fees are

\* As early as A.D. 1088, himself is a witness for his 100 *milites* (not necessarily all feudal tenants),—the *Durham MS.* is almost certainly from that of a writer, living *Wm. II.* : again *Caerlaverock* reports Anth. Bek had 160 *men at arms* in 1300, whilst *Ro. de Graystones* (contemporary), states, *habuit de familiâ suâ XXVI vexillarios et communiter de suâ sectâ CXL*

noted as not unless 10, for the bishops had granted 40s. per fee to the King, on all those fees they ought him for scutage, obtaining in return for themselves a like grant on all their fees, so that 1166-1242 the Durham bishoprick seemed to contain 70 and 150 fees, the whole however being not unless 10. Now plain it should appear that an immediate tenant's estate was never likely to be completely subinfeuded, and that the lord would reserve for himself some portion—the above case is extreme, but 'tis contrary to reason to suppose any tenant would systematically subinfeud at what rate himself had been enfeoffed; nevertheless such unreal conceptions have caused erudite statements as to measurement by Hides—so many Hides, so many Knights, etc., etc.; presumptions unwarranted by evidence, and very little flattering the sagacity of our predecessors.

Without much violence to probability it may be conceded that records of Hidage before 1086 existed (thus in D. B., in North Lincs, Staincliffe, Ewecross, parts of Cumberland and Westmorland are named no persons, stock, nor ploughs—save in 16 villis near Preston, where unknown—but the Hidage is given), and it also may be allowed that 5-6 Domesday Hides make an average Fee (as <sup>Average Fee.</sup> a grant to a lay tenant *in cap.*), but that is not to say that the first feoffment (presumably before the Book of Winton was written) was made by Hidation; certain it is that even in one county (Yorks) the subinfeudations vary greatly, thus 1205, 7 *John*, in Scawsby (Honour of Tickhill) 2½ carucates make a fee (Final Concords); temp.

*milites*, in the Scotch war—this of course must not be confounded with the *now* almost extinct *service*, and whether his retainers were *milites* or *men at arms*, any acquainted with the records of the period will not need to be informed they were probably mostly *ad vadia nostra* (i.e., of *Ed. I.*).

Variations  
very con-  
siderable.

Hen. III. (L. R. Rolls Series V. ii., p. 736) 60 car. make a fee in Swynnton, etc., and in A.D. 1300 (I. P. M. Rog. de Moubrai, as cited in Grainge's *Vale of Mowbray*) 159 car. make a fee—these are extremes, but ample confirmation of variations in practice may be found in the Testa de N., Kirkby's Quest, and Knight's fees 31 Ed. I. (see vol. 49 Surtees Soc.), and it may be remarked that the average 5-6 Hides would be far from applying on the one hand to Yorks, or on the other to Cornwall. The burden of supporting the 4, 5, or 6 Hide theory falls on its promoters, and receives no assistance from the subinfeudations of tenants *in cap.* which are quite untrammelled by any show of uniformity—the following from Domesday may be noted,

			Service.
Examples.	Fee of Wm. Perci in Yorks ...	385½ car.	} 30 fees
	” ” in Lincs ...	some 58½ ”	
	Fee of Earl of Richmond in Yorks	circa 1,172 ”	{ 50 fees in Yorks

and the Abbot of Ramsey had in all well over 300 Hides and Carucates, with a service of 4 Knights, but ecclesiastical fees are on a different scale to lay ones. Further if Fiefs had been distributed on the 4, 5, or 6 Hide plan, the value of a fee in Cornwall would have exceeded one in Derby more than 6 times; a grant of course might well be *as* by Hides, premising no uniformity; some average fee there must be, but it would be conveying but scant information of the ages of 4 individuals, two 60 and two 20, to state their average age as 40. The £20 p. a. value is another

rough standard of occasional correctness for the fee in its transit to extinction, (12 Car. II.), varied from £2-£3, but usually £5 to £8 p. a. (Book of Winton, by Pearson's values) to £200 p. a. (*Brady* who lived in the latter period), so it is to little purpose to cite average values, unless the times to which they pertain are observed, as the following may demonstrate :

WAPENTAKE OF CLARO (INCLUDING LIBERTIES OF RIPON AND KNARESBRO').

1065.		1085.		.	31 Ed. I.		20 Ed. III.
From Domesday		worth					
£	s. d.	£	s. d.				
169	19 6	54	6 7	{	Claro	$14\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{10}$	fees
					Ripon	$2\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{10}$	fees +
					Knarebro'	$3\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{10}$	1 car.
							$3\frac{1}{2}$ fees + 2 bov.
<i>Enrolled a/cs of the Exchequer.</i>							

That the subinfeudations by the chief lords were often in terms of the Hide and Carucate, appears from such records as the Testa, Kirkby's Quest, and Knight's Fees 31 Ed. I., but at no uniform rate, and clearly it would be easier to enfeoff in terms of already known Hides than in the often unknown acres ; but this is not to say that 2,000 acres, or yet 5-6 Hides, would contribute a couple of pounds to an *auxilium*, for the tax was primarily on the Fee, and only on Hides and carucates (for feudal taxation) as being members of same. For example in 1346 (Book of Aids) the Prior of Marton holds 1 carucate in Appletreewick of the lord of Skipton Castle (Yorks) of the King, whence 14 car. make 1 fee, and therefore is assessed at 2s. 10½d. to a 40s. aid, but in the same vill at same date Hen. de Kighley holds

1 bovate ( $\frac{1}{8}$  of 1 car.) of the Fee of Moubrai of the King, whence 28, etc., and therefore owes  $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. to the aid,—the one in double proportion to the other, and having examined each entry of 3 wapen-takes (Yorks) the writer can state that in no other sense is land taxed there than as part of a fief. For defect of service (fees were frequently unable to be found) doubtless the King had a right to claim, the *Servitia* being based on the render of the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Rolls; but the services of 1,000 Hides in military tenure would be a phrase of no meaning, and would have to be ascertained from former inquisitions or returns.

Baronial  
Charters,  
1166.

Reciting the explanation of the Barons' Certificates in *Feudal England*, which with a slight amendment appears warranted by the Charters, definite if disputed services were due by the immediate tenants to the King in respect of their holdings, which debt is named more or less distinctly in some half these documents. The royal enquiry had been not as to the service due, but how many Knights had been enfeoffed by 1 Dec., 1135 (the day in which Hen. I. was quick and dead), how many since, and how many (if any) were due on the "dominicum." The former are specified as fees of the old feoffment in contradistinction to those of new (Dec. 2, 1135 onwards), and the last enquiry refers to the balance between the service and the actual number of Knights enfeoffed, if such deficiency existed. The term "dominicum," tho' usually applied to land in the hands of the lord in 1166, is also applied to the non-infeuded portion of the fee prior to 1135

*Domini-*  
*cum.*



and 1166, thus Hugh de Dover (Kent) states that on his "dominium" are  $2\frac{1}{2}$  Knights\* of new feoffment, and Earl Eu (Sussex) that on his "dominium" are  $6\frac{1}{2}$  Knights\* whose names are, etc., and that he has no new feoffment. These certificates are the Primer of Feudal Tenures in England, but themselves contribute references to older times, which add to the scanty contemporary notices of Knight service, and it may be observed that no one in the days of Hen. II. (Certificates), John and Hen. III. (Testa de N.), or Hen. III. and Ed. I. (H. R.), seems to have been in doubt as to the early existence of the feudal system; in elder times the question would perhaps rather have been if such tenures were in usage before the Conquest (see Spelman's Works, rebutting that opinion which had been "legally" successful t. Car. I.). Hence the full burden of a demonstration lies on those who hold that tenure by Knight Service arose after 1086; the author of *Feudal England* has given (notably on pp. 295, 296) several retrospective references, to which I will add a few from the H. R. of Hen. III. and Ed. I. In 3 Ed. I. (p. 42, v. ii., p. 42) Wm. I. gave to Hugh . . . and his heirs as  $1\frac{1}{2}$  fees the Manor and Castle of Oakham; (*ibid.*) Wm. I. gave to a certain predecessor of Gilbt. de Umfravill the Manor of Hamildon as 1 fee; (*ibid.*) the Manor of Preston formerly demesne of Wm. I. given by him to a certain Earl as  $1\frac{1}{2}$  fees; (p. 166) 3 Ed. I., a note of a free socage from the time of Harold

Retrospective references of early enfeoffments.

\* *Id est*, held by military tenants (whether knts. or not), in proportions equal to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and  $6\frac{1}{2}$  fees.

the King [commended to the promoters of the fraternal "ceorls"]; (p. 231) 39 Hen. III. a free hundred of the Bp. of Salisbury's belonging to the church from ancient *feoffment* of Offa the King; (p. 337) 7 Ed. I. the Abbot of St. Albans holding of the King and adjoining Barony by service of 6 Knights for 40 days, likewise *enfeoffed* by Offa; (p. 337) another socage tenure from the time of the Conquest; (p. 637) 7 Ed. I. the Manor of Overton Waterville given to Wm. Olifareli at the time of the Conquest for  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee, who after long holding, committed a felony (seems to have been held by the Sheriff D. B. 1086), whence forfeited till King John, etc., and on same page another Manor in same place of whose service the predecessors of the Abbot of Peterboro' were *enfeoffed* in the time of King Edward before the Conquest, and it is  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a Fee. Now it may justly be remarked that these statements have little more than traditional value, and that the service of Hen. III. and Ed. I. is quietly assumed to have been that of Wm. I.; the same (I think) applies to like passages in the Testa de N. (pp. 295-6, *Feudal England*), which however can be surpassed (see pp. 314-5, T. de N.) where "from the conquest" is the usual form of the Jurors of Jerdeburg Wap., t. Hen. III. Of course in the present age, with much less probability, a like statement\* is not unusual, but it seems scarcely critical to accept the literal sense of records Hen. II.—Ed. I. as to the 11th century, and to confront King Offa's Knights' fees is somewhat of a problem: in the T. de N. a pedigree may appear from the Con-

Their  
authority.

\* *Vide*, works on Genealogy, County and Family Histories, etc.

quest (p. 87, Ric. Cheven\* who would answer well enough to Richard the hunter in D. B.), and the evidence in it and similar records is good to prove the general belief in those days of the antiquity of enfeoffment. Roger de Moubrai's charter (1166), informs of 88 old fees, and  $11\frac{3}{4}$  new, and 28 of the old had Nigel de Albigni enfeoffed "de dominio suo": this Nigel (his father), was one of those great men aggrandized by Hen. I., and the 60 fees (88 less 28) would seem to include parts of the estates of Robt. de Moubrai, and Robt. de Stuteville, escheats of Wm. II. and Hen. I. Dugdale quoting *Vitalis* states that Nigel de Albini married a second time in June 1118, and that his heir Roger de Moubrai was within his age 1138, 3 Step., (citing Ailredus Rieval.); the Pipe Roll passing for 31 Hen. I. makes it clear the said Nigel† was then deceased, hence all the 88 fees

\* In D. B., i. 250b, the name Chenvin occurs as a tenant T. R. E., and 1086.

† In 1086, a Nigel de Albini's principal estates were in Nigel Beds—he also held in Bucks, Leic. and Warw., and had held *d'Aubigni* in Berks (D. B. 59b); Hen. de Albeyni of Cainho would *and* appear to have succeeded to all or parts of the above in Beds, Roger de *Moubrai*. Bucks, and Leic., whose son and heir (Dugdale) Ro. in 1166 returns under Beds a *carta* of 25 fees of his Barony. In the *Baronage of England* the above Henry is stated to have been a younger son of Nigel (of the text), and a grantor (with the Lady Cicely, his wife) *i. Hen. I.*; this however can scarcely be correct, as Rog. de Moubrai (his presumed elder brother) is allowed by Dugdale to have been a *minor* at the Battle of the Standard [*3 Steph.*]; errors of course are inevitable in a so vast a work, whose author's painstaking labour would truly reflect the greatest credit on any age. Rog. de Moubrai in 1166, returned as under Yorks, 88 old fees, and  $11\frac{3}{4}$  new ones, comprising

## FIVE TABLES OF KNIGHTS' FEES, 1166—1346.

	1166-8, BARONS' CERTIFICATES AND PIPE ROLL.					1210-12 Inq., Total.	*a. 1253-4 Pipe Roll 38 Hen. III., Totals.	b. 1302 Inq., Total.	*c. 1346 Inq., Total.
	Ren- der.	"Ser- vice."	Ex- cess, Old.	Ex- cess, New.	Total.				
Beds	98 $\frac{3}{4}$	109 $\frac{3}{4}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	110 $\frac{1}{8}$	113 $\frac{1}{2}$	181 $\frac{1}{8}$	89 $\frac{3}{4}$	89 $\frac{3}{4}$
Berks	137 $\frac{1}{4}$	135 $\frac{1}{4}$	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	142 $\frac{3}{4}$	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	42 $\frac{3}{10}$	111 $\frac{1}{8}$	116 $\frac{1}{10}$
Bucks	152 $\frac{2}{3}$	155 $\frac{1}{3}$	12	4 $\frac{1}{4}$	172 $\frac{1}{2}$	170 $\frac{1}{2}$	81 $\frac{7}{10}$	163 $\frac{1}{5}$	181
Cambs	95 $\frac{1}{12}$	96	16 $\frac{3}{8}$	17 $\frac{7}{12}$	130 $\frac{3}{8}$	249	141 $\frac{3}{4}$	164 $\frac{1}{8}$	165 $\frac{1}{4}$
Cornwall	215 $\frac{3}{8}$	215 $\frac{1}{8}$	..	..	215 $\frac{1}{2}$	220 $\frac{1}{4}$	..	165 $\frac{3}{4}$	165 $\frac{3}{4}$
Cum'land	..	..	..	..	..	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{3}{4}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Derby	68 $\frac{1}{2}$	60	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{8}$	78 $\frac{5}{8}$	86 $\frac{1}{2}$	230 $\frac{7}{10}$	79 $\frac{1}{4}$	79
Devon	424 $\frac{1}{2}$	441	17 $\frac{3}{4}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	469 $\frac{1}{4}$	438 $\frac{1}{4}$	420 $\frac{1}{2}$	364 $\frac{1}{2}$	412
Dorset	113 $\frac{1}{2}$	114 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{12}$	11 $\frac{7}{30}$	137 $\frac{1}{3}$	423	411 $\frac{1}{3}$	116 $\frac{3}{10}$	127
Essex	379 $\frac{1}{8}$	320 $\frac{1}{4}$	59 $\frac{1}{12}$	30 $\frac{1}{4}$	409 $\frac{7}{12}$	414 $\frac{6}{8}$	679 $\frac{7}{12}$	264 $\frac{1}{20}$	267
Gloucester	392 $\frac{3}{4}$	392 $\frac{3}{4}$	47 $\frac{3}{8}$	20 $\frac{3}{4}$	461 $\frac{1}{8}$	Not found	408 $\frac{2}{10}$	135	135
Hants	137 $\frac{1}{2}$	137 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	153 $\frac{3}{4}$	Not found	142 $\frac{1}{4}$	170 $\frac{3}{8}$	170 $\frac{3}{4}$
Heretord	170 $\frac{1}{2}$	171 $\frac{1}{2}$	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{8}$	192 $\frac{1}{8}$	203	259 $\frac{7}{12}$	83 $\frac{3}{8}$	84 $\frac{1}{16}$
Herts	62	62	..	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	66 $\frac{1}{2}$	Incl. in Essex	See Essex	85 $\frac{1}{10}$	94 $\frac{3}{4}$
Hunts	35	35	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	2 $\frac{9}{10}$	40 $\frac{3}{8}$	Incl. in Cambs	See Cambs	43 $\frac{1}{8}$	49 $\frac{1}{8}$
Kent	215 $\frac{3}{4}$	193	24 $\frac{3}{4}$	7 $\frac{3}{4}$	225 $\frac{1}{2}$	224 $\frac{1}{4}$	155	259 $\frac{9}{20}$	266 $\frac{1}{8}$
Lancashire	..	..	..	..	..	91	..	..	29 $\frac{3}{4}$
Leicester	33	33	..	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	221 $\frac{1}{4}$	287 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	100
Lincs	351 $\frac{3}{8}$	364 $\frac{9}{10}$	51 $\frac{1}{2}$	21 $\frac{1}{4}$	438 $\frac{1}{2}$	312 $\frac{1}{2}$	392 $\frac{1}{20}$	442 $\frac{3}{10}$	428 $\frac{1}{8}$
Middlesex	35	35	26 $\frac{1}{12}$	..	61 $\frac{1}{12}$	36 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{4}$	19 $\frac{1}{4}$
Norfolk	338 $\frac{1}{10}$	337 $\frac{9}{10}$	21 $\frac{1}{4}$	38	397 $\frac{1}{2}$	475	646 $\frac{1}{8}$	450 $\frac{1}{8}$	458
Northants	126	128 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{3}{8}$	2 $\frac{1}{8}$	134 $\frac{1}{2}$	122 $\frac{1}{2}$	124 $\frac{1}{8}$	..	222 $\frac{1}{8}$
N'th'land	77 $\frac{2}{3}$	76 $\frac{2}{3}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	41 $\frac{1}{12}$	84 $\frac{1}{12}$	68	[91 $\frac{1}{2}$ ]	..	145 $\frac{1}{6}$
Notts	141	143 $\frac{1}{2}$	..	41 $\frac{1}{5}$	147 $\frac{7}{10}$	Incl. in Derby	See Derby	163 $\frac{1}{8}$	160 $\frac{3}{8}$
Oxon	56 $\frac{3}{8}$	56 $\frac{3}{8}$	..	1 $\frac{1}{20}$	58 $\frac{3}{8}$	Not found	85 $\frac{1}{20}$	168 $\frac{3}{4}$	168 $\frac{3}{4}$
Rutland	..	..	..	..	..	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	25 $\frac{3}{8}$	24 $\frac{3}{8}$
Salop	56 $\frac{2}{3}$	54 $\frac{9}{10}$	..	4 $\frac{2}{3}$	59 $\frac{1}{2}$	97 $\frac{1}{4}$	62 $\frac{9}{20}$	..	107 $\frac{1}{2}$
Somerset	253	253 $\frac{1}{4}$	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{8}$	273 $\frac{9}{12}$	Incl. in Dorset	See Dorset	281 $\frac{3}{8}$	289
Staffs	126	126	..	6 $\frac{3}{8}$	132 $\frac{3}{8}$	Not found	128	..	Un- com- puted
Suffolk	295 $\frac{1}{8}$	297 $\frac{1}{8}$	5	8 $\frac{1}{4}$	310 $\frac{5}{12}$	Incl. in Norfolk	See Norfolk	279 $\frac{1}{8}$	281 $\frac{1}{4}$
Surrey	3	3	1	..	4	24	9 $\frac{1}{8}$	69 $\frac{7}{10}$	73 $\frac{2}{8}$
Sussex	251 $\frac{1}{2}$	248	7 $\frac{9}{10}$	14	269 $\frac{11}{10}$	224 $\frac{3}{4}$	276 $\frac{1}{2}$	213 $\frac{2}{3}$	235
Warwick	124 $\frac{3}{4}$	124 $\frac{3}{4}$	..	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	132	156 $\frac{1}{2}$	See Leic.	..	87
West'land	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7 $\frac{2}{3}$
Wilts	174 $\frac{1}{4}$	174 $\frac{3}{8}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{10}$	199 $\frac{1}{5}$	176 $\frac{1}{4}$	174 $\frac{3}{4}$	207 $\frac{3}{10}$	227
Worcester	62 $\frac{5}{8}$	63 $\frac{3}{4}$	9	7 $\frac{1}{8}$	80 $\frac{3}{10}$	248 $\frac{1}{2}$	78	82 $\frac{2}{10}$	82
Yorks	515	495 $\frac{9}{12}$	79 $\frac{1}{2}$	47 $\frac{1}{4}$	622 $\frac{1}{12}$	490 $\frac{1}{3}$	441 $\frac{7}{10}$	348 $\frac{3}{8}$	394 $\frac{9}{8}$
	5,720 $\frac{7}{8}$	5,656	450 $\frac{3}{8}$	340 $\frac{2}{5}$	6,446 $\frac{3}{20}$	5,334 $\frac{3}{5}$	c. 5,959		c. 6,000*

NOTES TO TABLES OF KNIGHTS' FEES.

\**a* This was an aid to Knight Prince Edward, granted by the Prelates and Magnates, *scilicet de singulis scutis que de nobis tenentur in capite xl solidos tam de veteri feofamento quam de novo* (Lanc. Lay Subs.—J. A. C. Vincent—citing *Cl.* 37 Hen. III.), but with 2 or 3 exceptions new feoffment is quite omitted in the returns, these for the more part being equivalent to the *render* of 1168, that is, those fees alone for which the tenants were wont to respond for escuage, so that this column may be properly compared with the 1st one in the Table as regards the total. It should be understood that both in 1168 and 1253-4 the counties have a somewhat nominal significance—for a baron owning lands in divers shires *may* be returned under only one of them, and hence for any co. the result is likely to be both excessive and deficient, and the making a transcript from the Pipe Rolls of any particular shire does not of necessity answer to a list of its capital tenants by knt. service. There are several omissions in 1253-4, amounting under 11 entries to some 775 fees; *viz.*, the co. of Cornwall 215 $\frac{1}{3}$ ; portions of the fiefs of the Earldoms of Chester and Richmond, 114 and 106 $\frac{7}{8}$ ; Hon. Wallingford, 100 $\frac{1}{4}$ ; Hon. Lancaster, 72 $\frac{1}{3}$ ; the Archbp. Canterb., 60; fief of St. Valery, 50 less 11; Hon. B'stead, 22 $\frac{13}{20}$ ; and the fees late Wm. f. Robert, Wm. Traci, and Rog. Buron, 29, 6, and 10. Fiefs of less than 10 (*12 Hen. II.*) have not been traced, but it may be assumed with probability that some new fees had been granted since that date (*e.g.*, Hon. Knaresbro'); Cornwall is not found, having been granted to Earl of same in 15 Hen. III. (Dugdale) for 5 fees, who also held the Hon. of Wallingford (noted, but no payment nor return of fees): 12 counties answer in pairs, and N'land and Rutland have been supplied from the Roll of 40 Hen. III. (aid to knt.)—counting *en bloc* the composite entries under Honors (those under Boulogne, and Peverels of Essex, and Notts are answered by tenants of same, and taken as 3 entries) the tenants yield some 439 names, which allowing for omissions may be taken as *c.* 450, as against 300 in A.D. 1168. Neglecting the omissions, and taking the fees of 38 Hen. III. as 5959 in 439 entries, 9 tenants hold a full  $\frac{1}{4}$  of them (1572), and 29 over  $\frac{1}{2}$  (3012), but the majority of tenements consist of small fees ( $\frac{1}{16}$  to 2), leaving 204 names for upwards of 2 (fees), but 74 of them holding more than 20 fees. The returns of 12 Hen. II. on the same basis (*render*) yield 6339 fees (5721 + 618, as omissions here added) in 300 entries, of which 11 tenants hold  $\frac{1}{4}$  (1600), 34 a half (3204),

and a minority (94) 2 fees and under (2 to  $\frac{1}{4}$ ), leaving 206 holders of upwards of 2, of which 121 and 40 hold 15, and 50 fees and upwards respectively ; it is not thought probable that there were many (if any) single capital fees T. R. W. as will appear in the sequel. These rough analyses (correct, however, for practical purposes) of 12 Hen. II. to 38 Hen. III. show a natural increase of tenants due in the main to partition thro' heiresses ; after the Statute 18 Ed. I. (*Quia Emptores*) further increase should occur, but (if I err not) there are no existing records from which complete lists of contemporaneous holders of the Crown can be furnished.

Aid of  
1302.

\**b* Fourteen of these entries have been already printed in *Lancs. Lay Subs.* (J. A. C. Vincent), but those in the Table (save Wilts), are from *Enrolled Exch. a/cs L. T. R. No. 3*, the reference seemingly given for the 14 (*ut sup.*) being now changed (I am informed) to *Subs. L. T. R. No. 2*, which is less complete than *Enrolled*, etc. (*ut sup.*), but considerably more so than the list in *Lancs. Lay Subs.* ; with regard to which (p. 248 *ibid.*) Surrey is given £164 2s. 1d. (*i.e.*  $82\frac{1}{20}$  fees), a reading which neither of the above originals assign it (either reads £139 8s. od.), but both refer to Worcester, which the author of above vol. refrains to mention, nor were N. R., and E. R. of co. Yorks assessed as such (p. 248, *ibid.*) but portion of the former was taken with the latter, and balance of the former separately, as the details in the *Exch. Enr. a/cs (ut sup.)* amply demonstrate.

Total of  
Knights'  
Fees,  
*t. Ed. III.*,  
by con-  
temporary  
Scribe.

\**c* Sum of all the great fees in England (save Staffs)  $5,831\frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{8}$  plus 2s.  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. more in total = £11,663 17s.  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d. at £2 per fee ; small fees of Moreton in Somerset, Dorset, and Bucks,  $60\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{18}$  = £80 8s.  $8\frac{1}{2}$ d. at 2 marcs per fee ; small fees of Moreton in Devon,  $61\frac{1}{12}$  = £76 7s.  $0\frac{1}{2}$ d. at 25s. per fee : total sum, £11,820 13s.  $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. The writer being unsatisfied with the incomplete returns in the *Book of Aids* for this *Auxilium* instructed Mr. N. J. Hone, to search for it in *Enrolled a/cs of the Exch.*, where it was found in No. 3 ; the record certainly deserves publication *verbatim et litteratim*. It must be explained (the original MS. it is believed is a triumph of addition) that the writer for reasons of expediency has used slight license with Mr. Hone's figures (who must not therefore be accused of lack of accuracy) ; thus Hereford is returned as fourscore and four fees and the sixteenth part, and the half of the forty-eighth part of a fee, whereas  $84\frac{1}{16}$  fees appear in the table, and similar slender deviations (never  $\frac{1}{4}$  fee) occur in same.

are proveably old ones. Now the Moubrai fee <sup>Moubrai Fee.</sup> (Hen. II.—III.) is always rendered between 88 and 89 fees (usually  $88\frac{1}{4}$  fees), and in the Inquisitions 12-14 John (pp. 469-574, L. R., v. ii.) it is curious to observe  $60\frac{1}{4}$  fees (the  $\frac{1}{4}$  fee held of the Archbp. of York) are given by the Yorks sheriff, and just 28 by those of Lincs, Leicester, Cambridge, Hunts, and Warwick; Dugdale (quoting ancient authors) informs of the additions of the Northern Baronies of Moubrai and Stutteville t. Hen. I., and these would presumably pass with all the Knights those lords had enfeoffed. The Patent Roll of 20 Hen. VI. cites a grant of Massamshire from Earl Alan to Rog. de Moubrai, by the same service as his father Nigel de Albini held it, to wit 1 fee, and then proceeds to give the boundaries of his grant, which method may have run parallel with subinfeudation by hides and carucates, as where 14 car. make a fee (Skipton Fee, L. R., 1166).

Few better estimates have been made than Pearson's (cited in "Feudal England," p. 293) viz. 6,400 Knights' fees of 5 Hides each, stipulating for an average, and not a uniform 5-6 Hides; as an eclectic table is of doubtful value, the following explanations of the 1166-8 tenures are given—<sup>Method of computing fees, z. Hen. II.</sup> such entries in the Red Book (Barons' Cartæ.) as are of date posterior to t. Hen. II. are omitted,

comprising lands (I think) in Essex, Lincs, N'ants, Leics, Notts, Warwick, and Yorks (in the 4 last named also in Pipe Roll 31 Hen. I.); Nigel (his father), and Wm. de Albini (*Pincerna*), appear to have been younger sons of Henry of Cainho (*ut sup.*), who presumably was himself the son or brother of Nigel the Domesday tenant (vide *D. B.*; *Ord. Vit.*, and *Chron. Abingdon*).

whilst *some* in a hand later than the original are retained (*e.g.* nearly all the Yorks entries by the Sheriff) as of those who had not sent Charters, with further additions from the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll of fees military, but not from later ones, excepting the Abbot of Malmesbury (required to complete the military church tenants) who appears neither in the returns of 1166 nor 1168. By this method some 700-800 fees are lost, thus the Earl of Richmond 64, the balance between 140 (the least probable no.) and 76 named in the L. R. 1166 returns, the Honour of Boulogne, say 113, Earl of Leicester say 121<sup>7</sup>/<sub>10</sub>, the Honour of the Constable in Essex, say 57, part of the Earl of Chester's fees, say 118, Bernard de St. Valery, say 50, Simon Crevequer 13<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, with Peverel of Dover 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, and Hon. Lancaster 72<sup>1</sup>/<sub>3</sub>.<sup>\*</sup> The service due (including escheats) in 1166-8 there can be little doubt exceeded 6,000 fees, but by how much is difficult to estimate, as the largest tenements are those where most uncertainty prevails—to state the number as under 7,000 may be probable, but scarcely proveable. The 1st col. of the table gives the render of account in Pipe Roll 14 Hen II., with allowances for omitted returns from later Rolls (thus the whole of the Salop tenants sending charters are wanting 14 Hen. II.); the 2nd the services due where stated, and where not the “render” which method is erroneous for large tenements; the 3<sup>d</sup> the excess of old feoffment over service, by equating latter with “render.”

Explan-  
ation of  
5 column  
Table,  
4. Hen. II.

\* The fees of Earl Hunts. and the complement of the Chester fief (both unknown to writer) are here omitted.



where unstated, the 4th the excess of new feoffment on the same plan, and the 5th the total, probably short of the real one on the ground of incomplete returns from the larger tenements, where as a rule nothing is assigned to the dominicum. The 1st and 2nd column would be practically equal, if deductions were made from the former of excess by tenements in the hands of a *custos*, and certain exceptional cases (noted in the sequel) where the render is excessive and corrected in future returns. There are some 51 cases of fees from 10-75, where the service seems to be stated; made up as under, using O=Old, N=New, S.D=Super Dominicum

51 cases	24	cases of O + N + S.D.	(1 ecclesiastical)	Composi- tion of known "Service."
	14	" O + S.D.	(1 " )	
	8	" less than O	(3 " )	
	3	" O.		
	2	" O + N	(1 " )	

and 76 cases of fees of Lay Tenants, of service unknown but presumably exceeding 10, as under

42	cases of O.	4	cases O + N + S.D.	Composi- tion of unknown "Service."
15	" by Sheriff	4	" O + N	
8	" of O + S.D.	3	" less than O	

Total, 76 cases.

Thus it plainly appears in the known cases that O + N + S.D. is the most frequent service; whereas in the render of the unknown lay fees, O occurs very commonly; here the ecclesiastical fees are omitted, their conditions not being applicable to lay ones. For example the Honor of Totnes returns 49 old,  $19\frac{4}{15}$  new, and  $6\frac{1}{15}$  s. d., which amounts to 75 fees, the probable tho' unstated

Remarks  
on above.

service ; whereas the render is  $55\frac{7}{8}$  fees, which being palpably deficient, a debit of  $19\frac{1}{8}$  is entered against the tenant on the Pipe Roll (nevertheless  $55\frac{7}{8}$  fees or thereabouts becomes the basis of returns of Ric. I. to Hen. III.) ; but the Earl of Gos'ter whose service is unascertainable renders  $261\frac{1}{2}$  fees, whereas his charters inform of some  $258\frac{1}{2}$  old, and  $13\frac{1}{2}$  new in Gos'ter, besides 23 fees in Kent, which would be lightly rated at 300 (the Honor reputed to have been granted to Ro. Fitz Hamo by Wm. II.) ; also the Earl of Clare rendering 142, and debited with  $7\frac{3}{4}$  new, informs by charter of a similar number of fees, making no statement either as to service or a balance on the *dominium*, and it may be noted the Exchequer seems not to have material available for completing a defective return.

Total  
capital  
tenants (*ut  
de coronâ*),  
by Knight  
Service :  
render the  
usual basis  
of sub-  
sequent  
returns.

The total of tenants is about 300, and with some 11 exceptions (I think) the render of 14 Hen. II. (or a later render where not returned in that Roll) became the basis of assessment for Ric. I. to Hen. III. throughout England ; and in Yorkshire (and presumably for all England) for the reigns of Hen. III. and Ed. I. (as is proved by the aids to marry and Knight 29 and 38 Hen. III., and the Welsh Scutages of 42 Hen. III., 7 and 14 Ed. I. see Pipe Rolls) ; by the render is meant the *reddit compotum* only, not including the additional amount now and then debited to the tenant t. Hen. II. Of these 11 exceptional renders 5 were adjusted by 18 Hen. II. (the Irish scutage), and 4 more by 2 Ric. I.,

Exceptional Cases.				1168 R. C.	1172 R. C.	2 Ric I. R. C.	Exceptional cases.
Northumb.	Bolebec Walt	..	..	4 $\frac{1}{2}$			
	Bertram Rog.	..	..	6 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Yorks.	Bulmer Bert.	..	..	3 $\frac{2}{3}$ $\frac{1}{10}$	3 $\frac{1}{15}$	3 $\frac{1}{15}$	
	Camarar <sup>2</sup> Herb; Steph. f.	..	..	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	Gaunt Ro. de	..	..	17	not in	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	Laci Hen.	..	..	63 $\frac{3}{4}$ + 1 $\frac{1}{8}$	43 $\frac{3}{4}$	43 $\frac{3}{4}$	
	Paganel Wm.	..	..	16	15	15	
	Ros Everard	..	..	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{3}{4}$	not in	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	Skipton Hon.	..	..	21	"	12	
	Stutteville Wm.	..	..	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	8	8	
	Vesci Wm. de	..	..	26 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{9}{10}$	not in	24 $\frac{1}{3}$	

and of the rest, the fee of Bolebec Walt. has avowedly a service of 5 (Charter 1166) and is so given in Swereford's extracts from the Pipe Roll of 4 John, also p. 392 Testa de N. in the inquiries of 1212-1214, and not only is Rog. Bertram's service stated as 5 (Charter 1166) but is so returned in the above named inquest (p. 392, T. de N.).

Some 146 Charters state or practically state the service, which in 103 cases agrees with the render, and in 27 disagrees (the remainder not being found on the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll), but this excess is largely composed of very small fees, and this to such an extent that there are about 800 fees agreeing with the r. c. and the same number disagreeing; the majority of the important barons very prudently declining any information either as to their service or the debt on their "dominicum," are thus practically at their own assessment. Certainly in the reign of Hen. II. there are additional charges on new feoffment (much of which was due to the Crown), the relative payment or non-pay-

"Render"  
and  
"Service."

New  
feoffment.

ment of which would require to be sought out, but the attempt to enforce even the new that was owing (where not included in the render of 14 Hen. II.) seems to have been abandoned in later reigns (Ric. I.-Ed. I.). The consequence of the above probably was that there was much loss of service due, in addition to considerable difficulty in collecting the scutage on the basis of the 14 Hen. II. *render*, and doubtless numerous bad debts; Swereford has given enough extracts from the Pipe Rolls of Ric. I. and John (pp. 70-184 V. i. L. R. Rolls Ser.) to trace the "services" of fees, and there are the Inquisitions of 1210-1212 (pp. 469-574 *ibid.*), in addition to the already named Pipe Rolls of Hen. III. and Ed. I. Of far more importance than the supposed increase of service from 1168, and permanent change of assessment (p. 286, "Feudal England") was the attempt (likewise unsuccessful) of the Crown to make the church fees pay on excess of old feoffment; in 15 Hen. III. (Brady's "Hist. Eng." V. i., App. p. 42, citing Pat. Rot. 15 H. III.) the prelates conceded to the King 40s. per fee, on those fees they were wont to answer for to military service, but were permitted to have service of all their fees for themselves at the like rate; again 19 Hen. III. (Brady *ut supra*, pp. 43 and 44, citing Close Roll) an aid had been conceded on church and lay fees of both old and new (to marry the King's sister), the collections, etc., for which appear in the Testa de N.; and that the concession of 19 Hen. III. was exceptional is plainly brought out by Pat. 20 H. III. m. 8 (cited by Madox) to

Excess of  
old feoff-  
ment, on  
ecclesias-  
tical fees,  
not usually  
paid.

wit, that it was from all the ecclesiastical fees, as well those of which response is made to scutage, as of others retained to the tenants' own use, the grant not to be drawn into a precedent.

In 27 Hen. III. the lay tenants who did not join the Gascony expedition fined and conceded scutage (voluntarily) of both old and new, but the Bishops conceded 40s. per fee on their *service*, and in return were allowed for themselves, to take 40s. from all their fees (Mich. Comm., 27 Hen. III., as cited by Madox); the inquisitions and collections (from the prelates) may be found in the Testa de N. ;\* where the 19 and 26 Hen. III. items are the chief contents as regards feudal service alone; the inquests of *John's* reign being frequently as to the rights of the Crown and subtractions of service (with tenure by knight service, serjeanty, and socage often occurring together), and no systematic returns about old and new feoffment. The difference between the aid

Aid to marry, 1235, and Gascony Scutage, 1242.

\* It is to be hoped, in case of a new issue of the Testa de Nevill, *Minerva* will temporarily endow its editor with so much of discretion as to enable him to distinguish, say, between an undated inquisition of the reign of John and Hen. III. ; see the note p. 733, vol. ii., Red Book Rolls Series, placing the extent of Nigel de Moubrai's fee (probably 15-25 Hen. III. during the heir's minority) as later than the inquisitions of the Gascony Scutage (pp. 363 and 366, T. de N.) of *circa* 26 Hen. III. Either these inquests in Yorks are fragmentary or incomplete returns; the Moubrai fee proves this, for the inquisition (p. 733 as above) is considerably fuller than that in the Testa for this county. With reference to the date of the Testa returns (pp. 363 and 366), both the form of the record and the names of the tenants should have been sufficiently significant.

Testa de Nevill.

Northum-  
berland In-  
quisitions,  
26 Hen. III.

Evidence  
of *Testa de  
Nevill*.

to marry 19 Hen. III., the Gascony escuage 26 Hen. III. and an ordinary aid (as 29 and 38 Hen. III.) and escuage (as 42 Hen. III.) was that in the two former payment was made on all fees or all that could be found, in the latter on those only recognised in the *renders* of the tenants' antecessors in 14 Hen. II. ; what old and new feoffment meant 19 and 26 Hen. III. is not significant, and was perhaps differently understood by divers tenants, but in the 1242 Inquisitions Northumberland (p. 381, etc., *Testa de N.*) old feoffments are those made in and before Hen. II., new ones from *t. John*, which is to be seen by reference to the Inquisitions of 12-13 John (*T. de N.*, pp. 392-3, under heading *T. de N.*), which latter are abstracted in the *L. R.* (pp. 562-5, v. ii. *Rolls Series*). There is not the least witness of *general* inquisitions of old and new feoffment prior to 1242 (saving the case of the aid to marry 19 Hen. III.) where the evidence seems to have consisted partly of charters of the magnates (referred to in the sequel), and partly of inquiries made by the Sheriff ; as examples the Bp. Durham (service 10) pays on 150, 19 Hen. III., is noted for 10, 26 Hen. III. ; the Bp. Hereford pays on 18, 19 Hen. III. (service 15), and the Archbp. of York is noted for 20 (his service) 26 Hen. III. ; but the monastic houses on both occasions (in theory) pay on all their fees ; thus 19 Hen. III. Abbotsbury (1) pays on  $3\frac{3}{4}$ , Cerne (2) on 5, Pershore (2) on 5, and also in 26 Hen. III., when Ramsey (4) pays on  $33\frac{1}{3}$ , Winchcombe (2) on 5, and Malmesbury (3) on  $6\frac{2}{3}$ , but perhaps sometimes these were compositions.

Returning to 1166-8, there were I think nearly 500 fees newly created (1135-1166) of which

*About 210 debited on the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll.*

Due to the Crown	...	...	...	45	fees
By <i>custos</i>	...	...	...	1½	"
Not due, but claimed	...	...	...	35	"
Doubtful	...	...	...	128	"

Extent of  
so called  
exactions  
of "new  
feoff-  
ment."

*About 273 not debited on the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll.*

Of which, no returns	...	...	...	15	fees
Included in render	...	...	...	96½	"
Not due nor charged	...	...	...	78	"
Doubtful, not charged	...	...	...	70	"
Due, but not charged	...	...	...	13½	"

so that far from annexing all new feoffment, the Exchequer did not even always demand payment when due. Some new fees are included in the render, and the majority of doubtful cases appear to be due, and after all the total demands for further payments, owing, doubtful, or otherwise, were but on a minimum of fees, *i.e.*, 210 out of some 6,000-7,000 : the following examples are of fees due, not charged.

	Service.	Old.	New.	S. D.	Paid.	Debited.
Pinkeni Gilb. ..	15	11½	1½	2	13½	<i>Nichil</i>
Windlesores Wm.	20	16½	1½	1½	18½	"
Wahull Walt. ..	30	27½	1½	1½	27	"
Foliot Ro. ..	15	13½	3½	—	13½	"
Corneilles Ric. ..	10	6	1	3	9	"
Chauz Ro. ..	15	12½	2½	½	12½	"
Fossard Wm. ..	33½	27	1	5½	31½	"

The chief features of the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll seem to be the presumptive escape, of many of the

Evidence  
of Pipe  
Roll,  
*14 Hen. II.*

magnates, from a payment adequate to their probable service, and the attempt to tax the church on all her fees of old feoffment ; few lay barons of known service of 10 fees and upwards had any excess of old ; these cases are all in Essex, viz., Essex Galf. Comes, Mountfichet Wm., and Walt. f. Ro. (who all fall back on what their men tell them, and whose charters were perhaps indebted to the ingenuity of the same scribe), with the possible exception of Earl Ferrars ; but on the other hand excess of old was quite common in church fees, which (if I have observed rightly) are somewhat as under

Summary of Church Fees, 1166.	Service.	Archbps. and Bps.	461½	Monastic Houses	294⅔	Total.	756⅙
	Total Fees,	"	743¼	"	343⅔		1,087⅔
			Service.			Excess.	
			Old.	New.	S. D.	Old.	New.
Bps. etc.	..	..	451¼	3½	6¾	240⅔	41½
Mon. Houses	..	..	284¼	½	9¾	451⅕	3¾
			736⅙	4	151½	2861⅓	44⅝

Ecclesiastics as a rule "render" their services, and are debited with excess old, but not excess new, which latter just in a few cases is included in the r. c., so that of some 263 cases of excess old debited on the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll almost all belong to the Church; this is a less total than 286 (above) but the Archbp. of Canterbury's fee (paid by a *custos*) is included in the render, and the Abbot of Peterboro' is not charged (with his excess),—in addition slight deficiencies in the charters render exact figures (when collating with the 14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll) impracticable. Of the



balance between  $450\frac{3}{8}$  fees (total of  $3^d$  col. being excess of old) and 263 (Pipe Roll), Wm. de Romara is charged with  $9\frac{1}{2}$  fees relaxed, which with the excess of render over service by certain lay tenants accounts for about 80 fees ; of the remainder most of 84 fees were probably due tho' not rendered (service unknown), and with the cases of Canterbury and Peterboro' account for the total. Thus Nigel de Luvetot (Hunts) probably owes the  $12\frac{3}{4}$  fees he names in his Charter, tho' he escapes by paying on 10, hence he must be supposed to have excess of old (service unstated), so that I presume about 84 of the  $450\frac{3}{8}$  excess of old were due to the Crown—taking the Church fees to have been correctly assessed by their renders.

Perhaps amongst the curiosities of the Exchequer might be found a case of a Bishop or Abbot paying on a fee he did not recognise, but saving by a *custos* it has not been the writer's good fortune to discover an example thereof—thus in Pipe Roll 1 Ric. I. (1189) the Archbp. of York and Bp. of Durham still owe their contributions (of unrecognised fees) for the aid to marry the daughter of Hen. II. (1168). Pearson's table of Valets (Hist. Eng., pp. 665-9) for 21 Southern Counties estimates the home ecclesiastics as being lords of about  $\frac{3}{10}$  of the land in 1086 ; and of the total fees of 1166 the Church possess  $\frac{1}{8}$  to  $\frac{1}{7}$ , so that the presumption lies, that tho' in proportion to their service the religious had far more Knights than the lay barons, their "dominicum" was still in greater comparative excess.

Unrecognised liabilities, and extensive demesnes of ecclesiastics.

In the 40,000 acres of the Liberty of Ripon,

"Liberty  
of Ripon."

Inade-  
quacy of  
Col. 2,  
Table I.

the Archbp. of York had (31 Ed. I. and 20 Ed. III.) not quite 3 fees, which I suppose in the language of the Exchequer (still current) would be some 12 or 15 Hides of 160 acres each, or at most 36 carucates of 120 ac. (each); it is very evident the ecclesiastics were lightly rated, which perhaps explains their exemplary fines or promises when the King was going on an expedition. As already noted the second col. in the Table termed "Service" is erroneous, for the Render is not likely to equal same in the larger unascertained fees, as there is no reason why in these the old feoffment should be the total due, when  $S = O + N + S. D$  is the commoner equation. Finding therefore that in known fees with a service of 1,232 (taking the 45 lay cases from previous table of 51 known) there are some 1,070 of old, the "service" from unknown fees may be gauged roughly from the old feoffment: of the 76 cases named before, 15 are returned by the Sheriff (and hence omitted), leaving some 2,653 fees of old, which it is presumed might be answerable for a service of 3,055 fees, and the difference 402 is a supposed balance to bring the estimated service more in line with that of the known fees, enabling subject to correction the underwritten table, which is thought to be low rather than high:

Estimate of "Service," 1166.	"Service," as shown in 2nd col. ... ..	5,656
	Deficiency (estimated) ... ..	402
	*Omissions (see list) ... ..	618
	<i>Service</i> ... ..	6,676 fees

\* *Vide* p. 54, and note pointing out what fees are still uncomputed in list of omissions (618).

Making the convenient assumption of 6,756 fees of which the Church held 756 and the lay Barons 6000, and supposing 9,000,000 acres held by the former, and 15 millions by the latter, a Knight's fee† as against the King, would then have a scope of some 12,000 acres if ecclesiastical, and 2,500 acres if lay: in addition to the above (to estimate additional fees beyond service) there would have to be added such excess of old and new feoffment as has not been calculated in the adjustment (402), which (if I have not erred) would be somewhat as under:

Fees, answered by the Sheriff	...	...	745	
Old feoffment	...	...	4,903	
New feoffment	...	...	483	
Super dominicum ( $108\frac{1}{2} + 315\frac{1}{2}$ ) =	...	...	424	
Omissions (see list)	...	...	618	
				Estimate of Total Fees.
Total ... .. 7,173 fees*				

the "deficiency" (402) of the former table being found amongst the new, and s.d. in the above; whilst the omissions and Sheriffs' estimates do not permit of being further specified. Perhaps one might say the lay Barons had some 32,000 Domesday Hides plus 2,000-3,000 imaginary carucates‡ in Durham and Northumberland, which would furnish nearly 6 Hides per Fee as against the King, of a scope of 430 acres each, or somewhat approaching to 400 ac. if allowance be made for land which never was

† It is not of course meant to be conveyed that an entire fee comprised nothing but military tenants; nevertheless the tenants in socage, and all the acres of land on a feudal lord's estate may from one point of view be regarded as portion of his fee, and therefore of his service; and thus in defence towards the king.

\* *Vide* note, p. 54; hence total more than 7173.

‡ There is no intention to state the non-existence of carucates here, in and prior to 1086, *vide* Hist. St. Cuthbert.

hided, and "carucates" in hidated counties: these 400-430 acres might by a convenient Exchequer fiction be reckoned as 120-160 ac. of lucrable land.

Taking characteristic examples from the 1166 Certificates

		Service.	Old.	New.	S.D.	Render.	Debited.	Notes.
Characteristic Examples.	<i>Ecclesiastical Fee.</i>							
	Bp. Lincoln	60	102	2	—	60	42 old	
	<i>Lay Fees (known).</i>							
	Hamo f.	15	11 $\frac{7}{10}$	11 $\frac{0}{10}$	the balance	15	quit	
	Meinfelin							
	Wahull Walt	30	27 $\frac{7}{12}$	1 $\frac{1}{2}$		27	"	
	Scalars	15	10	—	5	15	"	
	Steph.							
	Ro. f. Wm.	30	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	29	1 new	
	Beauchamp, Wm.	7	10	—	—	not found	not found	In later records quit for 7; an unusual case
	Pagnet Ger- vase	50	50	5 $\frac{2}{3}$	—	50	quit	
	Foliot Ro.	15	13 $\frac{3}{4}$	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	—	13 $\frac{3}{4}$	"	
	<i>Lay Fees (unknown).</i>							
	Glos'ter Earl of	—	258 $\frac{1}{2}$ } + 22 $\frac{8}{8}$ }	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	261 $\frac{1}{2}$	quit	
	Lascy Hugh de	—	54 $\frac{1}{4}$	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	51 $\frac{1}{4}$	"	
	Reginald Earl	—	215 $\frac{1}{3}$ fees			215 $\frac{1}{3}$	"	
	Hugh Earl	—	121	35 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	125 $\frac{1}{4}$	37 $\frac{1}{2}$	
	Richmond Earl	—	—	—	—	50	quit	In Yorks by Sheriff

In a return (pp. 26-7) in Gale's Honor of Richmond purporting (see Observations) to be of Hen. II., 68 $\frac{1}{2}$  knights' fees are noted for Richmond-

shire (service 50); and altho' the Redvers fee answered (14 Hen. II. Pipe Roll) for but 89 fees, it avowedly contained over 100 (20 Hen. II. Pipe Roll); the above table shows somewhat the easy assessment of such important tenants as make indefinite returns. It may be suggested that in his charter a tenant now and then states his new feoffment within his statement as to *s. d.*; but as a whole the certificates demonstrate this term (*s. d.*) to be used for land in the lord's hands in 1166: Lamb. de Scoteni informs of a service of 10, and has 5 fees of old, and 5 *s. d.*, remarking that he has  $\frac{3}{4}$  new, enfeoffed "*ex illo dominio*," and renders 10, but is debited with  $\frac{3}{4}$  new, but probably his charter should be read as service 10, old 5, new  $\frac{3}{4}$ , and *s. d.* 5 less  $\frac{3}{4}$ . Again Rad. de Worcester states his service to be 1, and that he has enfeoffed  $\frac{41}{2}$  of his fee of new, the balance being *s. d.*; accordingly he renders 1, but is debited with  $\frac{41}{2}$  new; taking a line from all the certificates together demonstrates that usually the addition of old, new, and *s. d.* determines the service. The total entries are about 300, not including the tenants of the 618 fees given under omissions, but the former number contains a few double entries; of this total 261 are lay, and 39 church fees. There are in all 125 cases of fees less than 5, and 155 less than 10, leaving 145 of 10 and upwards; of known fees from 10-75 are 51 cases, of which, I think, some 10 cases with fractional dimensions, the remaining 41 being by service 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 50, 60 and 75; where the service is unstated (for large fees) there is little uniformity, probably pointing to a defective render, and

*Super dominicum.*

Statistics of Fees.

further, cases of subsequent addition (known service) may have disturbed round figures, as in the case of Hen. de Lacy (Yorks) whose service (if I have observed rightly) should be read as 60 less 20 plus  $3\frac{3}{4}$ .

The Computation of the Service of the Lay Tenants is entirely based on their own statements, which are scarcely likely to have exaggerated the debt, and it may be called to mind that in 1086 (D. B.) were some 1400 tenants in capite (Ellis), of which it seems unlikely that 300 (if so many), were capital tenants of the Crown by Knight service.

Capital  
tenants,  
1086 and  
1166.

Inquisi-  
tions  
4. John.

The returns in the Table for 1210-12, are of somewhat doubtful accuracy; the totals for 1166-8 and 1346 have been considerably laboured, but that of the former date quickly run up; the inquisitions of King John give lists of tenants of whose services the sheriff is ignorant, and are otherwise incomplete, etc., for example 200 fees may be subtracted from Worcestershire (p. 567, V. ii. L. R. Rolls Series), as Walter Beauchamp is there given 207 fees instead of the correct 7, (see T. de N. p. 43).

Later In-  
quisitions.

The method of raising scutage and aid (T. de N.) temp. Hen. III. from all fees has already been referred to, which is repeated in the reigns of Ed. I., Ed. II. and Ed. III. for both purposes; from whence the valuable topographical inquisitions of Kirkby's Quest and Knights' Fees (Ed. I.), the Book of Aids (Ed. III.), and of Knights' Fees 6 Hen. VI.; the Crown seemed in constant alarm lest lack of service should occur and it is not

surprising to find that England contained little more than 6,000 fees in 1346. These I suppose were all that the jurors could or would find, and consisted of old and new without distinction; whether most of the fees which had formerly been returned as "super dominicum" were discovered is not quite so clear. Again deductions should be made from the total, as presumably there would be cases similar to those of the Abbots of Fountains, Furness, etc., who successfully (I think) disputed their indebtedness on some of the fees they were charged with. The aid to marry Blanche daughter of Hen. IV. is set forth in the Enrolled A/<sup>cs</sup> of the Exch. (partial returns in the Book of Aids); thus for W. R. Yorks (some 150 fees in 20 Ed. III.) the collectors render account of £12 6s. 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. for 11 $\frac{3}{4}$  fees, and the third part of a  $\frac{1}{3}$  part of a fee, and 4 car. 7 bov. of land whence 10 etc., and whence 8 bov. make 1 car. held immediately of the King in W. R., of each fee 20s., and of more, more, and of less, less etc.; and of 27s. 2d. of £27 3s. 5d. worth of land held of the King in socage (*sine medio*) at the rate of 20s. for £20 and for more, etc.: this is an interesting return, as it would appear that the lands held by others\* of "les

Inquisitions of 1346.

Returns of 4 Hen. IV.

\* *Vide* the government volume, "Feudal Aids," in co. Berks, where the returns cite tenor of Statute 25 Ed. III. (20s. per Knight's fee held immediately of the Crown, for more, etc., and 20s. for each 20 *li.* la. held of the King *sine medio*, for more, etc.), but the editor in his introduction (p. xxvi) renders this 20s. per Knight's fee, and the like for 20 *li.* la. held in socage. The form in the record is of course correct, and as is not unfrequently the case with

grauntz" escaped taxation as knights' fees. Comparison should be made with similar aids of 14 Hen. II., 29 Hen. III. and 38 Hen. III. where

Change of  
method  
observed  
in these  
returns  
(1403).

volumes published at the common charge, discovers their editor's failure to understand his subject; thus, in the co. of Cornwall is but  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee immediately held, and no capital socage tenant of the Crown [whereas in 1346 (see p. 50) were some 165 $\frac{3}{4}$  Knights' fees and of course numerous socagers holding of lords of same]; had the levy in 4 Hen. IV. been per Knight's fee, the above would have owed to respond, as they did in 31 Ed. I. and 20 Ed. III. on like occasions, being then required to be answered *de quolibet feodo militari* (Rot. Parl., i. 25), and *de singulis feodis militum* ("Feudal Aids," A.D. 1346). No reader of course should be content to take his views at second hand, when the originals can be consulted, but regarding the vast accumulations of ancient evidences printed during the 19th cent., a certain understanding of mediæval usages might justly be expected from any historical writer allowing himself to expound them. It is quite clear that in the 12th and earlier part of the 13th cent. a capital tenant was answerable as well for his fees held in demesne, as for those held of him by others: it is equally certain that in the 15th cent. the fees held by others of a tenant *in cap.* were not esteemed to be by him held in chief—the returns of this aid (4 Hen. IV.) for 30 counties are extant amongst the Exch. enrolments (the Book of Aids is very incomplete as to same), and *including socage* total under £1,075, whereas from *each* Knight's fee (1346), *with no socage included*, the collectors are burdened with £11,663 17s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. from 36 cos. (the rate £2 per fee), which would appear to demonstrate that  $\frac{1}{6}$ th of the total Knts' fees were then in demesne. A tax of 20s. on every 20 *li.* la. held in socage indiscriminately would of course have produced a very considerable sum, but it betrays a singular confusion of ideas to consider the immediate socagers of the Crown as answering to above: some or all capital tenants by serjeanty responded to the 4 Hen. IV., but (I think) not so from Wards, Escheats, or Honors, nor from Baronies (to the collectors at any rate). At this date the Bp. of Ely held by the latter tenure for



the barons answered the tax (in the two latter cases on the scutage assessment, *i.e.*, the 14 Hen. II. *render*); and with those of 19 Hen. III., 31 Ed. I. and 20 Ed. III., where usually the King's collectors gathered the aid from all the fees they could find: the 6 Hen. VI. Inquest cited above, applies but to those who had more than  $\frac{1}{4}$  fee, and the returns are extremely slender for W. R. Yorks (see Book of Knights' Fees, and the Yorkshire Lay Subsidy of that date), so that the land was presumably held for the more part by tenants under the limit; regarding the later aids of Hen. VII. and Jac. I. I have not found that *any estimate by fees* was attempted.

Returns of  
6 Hen. VI.

No returns  
of Knights'  
Fees, *t.*  
Hen. VII.,  
and Jac. I.

In the Inquisitions of 12-13 John (as abstracted in the Red Book) I find but one note of new feoffment in the case of Gilbert Peche, whose fee might then be in the hands of the Crown; his father's certificate (1166) is practically repeated, the new being  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{8}$  in both cases, but occasional references to new fees occur in the records *t.* John in the T. de N., presumably of those which had been enfeoffed in that reign. In 19 Hen. III. the aid to marry was paid to collectors, to the Sheriff, and also directly into the wardrobe, or Exchequer (see T. de N.); to all or many of the magnates the King had written, instructing them to return to the Exchequer a list of their fees as well old as

Further  
evidence  
from the  
*Testa de  
Nevill.*

6 fees, and the Abb. of Glastonbury for 3 (fees), which is the precise no. of Knts. for which they answered in the Marshals' Rolls of 29 Hen. III., 5 and 10 Ed. I., and 4 Ed. II., though their service (including fees held by others) in 1166 was 40 fees each.

new : eight of these charters may be found on pp. 44, 415, and 416 of the T. de N., and another (that of Ro. Beauchamp of Hache) is to be seen along with the King's writ in Madox's *Form. Ang.* I give an extract from the return of the Abbot of St. Edmund's to the Exchequer, who commences by naming the precept of the King, as to certifying how much of the aid for the marriage of his sister had been paid to the *Exch.* and how much to be paid, how many fees, in what counties and vills, and what of old and of new, and follows "Nos concessisse domino Regi sexies viginti marcas. Ex quibus jam solvimus ad scaccarium medietatem scilicet sexaginta marcas alia vero medietas adhuc restat solvenda. Feoda vero militum de veteri feoffamento habemus quadraginta que tenemus in capite de domino Rege etsi respondemus pro illis pro temporis necessitate. Alia vero xij feoda habemus de novo feoffamento que capta sunt et feoffata de nostris propriis dominicis. Et pertinent ad nostram. Que nulli respondent nec unquam responderent nec respondere debent nisi soli abbati Sancti Eadmundi. Et ipse abbas nemini respondet de illis predicta vero feoda partim sunt in Norff' et Suff' partim in Essex'. In quibus vero villis sint constituta vel quid et quantum in quo loco Deus novit." Now be it observed that the Edmondsbury service was 40, and that in 1168 there were some  $52\frac{1}{2}$  old and  $\frac{1}{4}$  new fees ; hence it appears the Abbot in 1235 understood by new feoffment any surplus fees beyond what he was wont to answer for to a scutage, and also he seems to have compounded at a rate equal to 60 fees ; likewise the Abbot of

Ramsey who pays 60 and 100 marcs respectively in 1235 and 1242\* equal to 30 and 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  fees. The King's mandate to the Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk (p. 282 T. de N.) dated 6 May 20 Hen. III. mentions the charters of the magnates, and that the Sheriff shall certify of those holding 1 fee and less; and presumably a like method might be used in other counties.

The Gascony Scutage has been dealt with in the Preface to Vol. II. (L. R. Rolls Series), notwithstanding the editor's failure to recognise the Yorkshire returns in the Testa de Nevill; (see his note p. 733, Vol. II., *ibid.*, citing T. de N., pp. 625 and 638), and it may suffice to add that inquisitions of this date (*circa* 1242) occur in almost every county named in the T. de N., and to point out that the monastic houses had not commuted their service in the same way as the bishops. Northumberland is well given in the T. de N., as there are inquisitions *circa* 1210-12 (12-13 John) on pp. 392-3, collections for the aid to marry (pp. 394-5), and the later Gascony inquests commencing on p. 381; the following fines from Dugdale's Baronage (citing Pipe and Fine Rolls), may be noticed in this connection; calling to mind that those who "had their service" abroad had scutage (for themselves) of their men, and that said escuage was 3 marcs per fee, but that most of those who fined conceded their scutage also.

---

\* 1235 and 1242 are dates used with latitude for the aid to marry and the Gascony scutage; in neither case were the debts all paid in those years.

		26 Hen. III. Fines <i>ne trans.</i>	14 Hen. II. Render.	Notes.
Fines <i>ne trans</i> <i>fretant.</i>	Warwick Thos. Earl	{ 120 li. 120 li.	102½ fees (32 more 38 Hen. III.)	{ 1st fine lest he trans- fret 2nd fine to have his scutage
	Albini Wm. .. ..	20 marcs	33 "	Heir to the Yorks fee of Bulmer By Simon, Earl Hunts, in 1166
	Beauchamp Ro .. ..	80 m.	17 "	
	Perci Wm. .. ..	100 m.	30 "	
	Nevill Ro. .. ..	10 li.	3½ "	
	Gaunt Gilb. ... ..	200 m.	68½ "	
	Stuttevill Wm. .. ..	15 m.		
	Umfravill Gilbt. .. ..	100 m.		
	Baiocis Jo. .. ..	100 m.	17 "	

Instances of the so-called "enfeoffment" prior to the Conquest have been already cited from the H. R., and I suppose few will deny that the Hide was a Saxon, and the Fee a Norman institution; but the theory that the figures of 1166-8 (say total *renders*) represent the number of Knights due *in exercitu t.* Wm. I., seems fully as improbable as the unwarranted emergence of the Fee from the Hide. The editor of the Red Book (Rolls Series) appears to think otherwise, as the following citations from his preface to Vol. II. indicate:

Supposed  
develop-  
ment of the  
Fee from  
the Hide.

- p. clxi. "the ancient system of assessment for imperial taxation, which in the shape of a common assize continued to be apportioned according to the old plan of hidation—for scutage and aid . . .—down to a far later period."
- (1)
- p. clxi. "the normal Knight's fee contained 4 hides—a scale which seems to have been recognised as late as the 16th century," with note, citing H. R., II. 830.
- (2)
- p. clxii. "unless the actual extent of the holding should prove (upon inquisition taken) to contain an

- equivalent for hidation. So when an inquisition was taken throughout the Kingdom, for the assessment of a Scutage, the Sheriffs were required to return the number of fees in each hundred, estimating their extent by the actual number of hides or proportions of a hide," citing the T. de N. and the Abbot of Ramsey's case.
- (3) p. clxiv. "and moreover the extent of the hide or carucate is often stated in denominations of an acre both of arable and pasture land," citing Kirkby's Quest, fo. 228.
- (4)

It has already been allowed that sub-infeudations were (or are returned) by Hides and Carucates, whence so many make a fee; the establishment of the feudal system did not of course extinguish hides (as units for rates and taxes) or acres as areal measures, but as less than 3 or more than 150 carucates might make a fee, and in a feudal tax contribute not by the rate of carucates but at that of fees, it is difficult to discern how this can be termed a tax on the land unit. For instance taking examples from the T. de N. which seems to be indicated in the 3rd of the above extracts, on p. 337 the Earl of Chester holds in Horsinton 2 carucates of which Walt. de Bolesby holds 1, whence 11 bovates (*i.e.*,  $1\frac{3}{8}$  car.) make a fee, and lord Simon de Kyme holds the other whence 20 bovates ( $2\frac{1}{2}$  car.) make etc., and on p. 249 in the Gascony inquisitions in co. Beds., Peter de Lekeburn holds 8 virgates (2 Hides) for  $\frac{1}{6}$  of a fee; Walt. f. Alex. holds 1 virgate for  $\frac{1}{15}$  of a fee (here  $3\frac{3}{4}$  Hides make 1 fee), the Prior of Neuham 2 Hides for  $\frac{1}{16}$  of a fee (32 Hides per fee), and further divers tenants

Remarks  
on same.

The theory  
refuted by  
numerous  
Records.

hold Hides and Virgates, with the rate of the tenure omitted. The return that the jurors are ignorant of the service is by no means a novelty to those acquainted with records of the kind, and should these unknown fees be made to contribute to a feudal aid, their Hides, Virgates, etc., will necessarily be brought into some proportion. Examples have already been given [20 Ed. III. and 4 Hen. IV. (see pp. 45, 69) aid to Knight and marry, Knaresbro', and W. R. Yorks] of odd carucates and bovates; in the latter, the number of carucates per fee is stated, but in the former not, nevertheless as (see p. 45, Knaresbro')  $3\frac{1}{8}$  fees + 2 bovates are given against £6 5s. 10d. in a 40s. aid, it must be plain that the couple of bovates equal  $\frac{1}{48}$ th of a fee, equal to whence 12 etc., just as in the latter record where there are 4 car. 7 bov. over, whence 10 etc., they are  $\frac{39}{80}$  of a fee, as is proved by the amount received. And further anyone inspecting the inquests of knights' fees (apart from those of serjeanty and socage) in the T. de N. will find it quite exceptional for Hides or Carucates to be named alone; *i.e.*, without giving their varying value as fractions of fees; and naturally if the jurors did not know the amount of tenure they would limit their statement to the convenient hides etc.; for under the same tenant in capite (see I. P. M. Rog. de Moubray 29 Ed. I., 1300) there might be extremely various scales of sub-infeudation, just as in the same Manor the Hide might (even at the same time) contain a different number of acres.

The following records from Hen. I. to Hen. VI. will bear out the above ;

	Reign.
List of Peterboro' Knights (Camden Soc., 1849)	Hen. I.
Barons' Certificates (Red Book Exch.) ... ..	Hen. II.
Testa de Nevill } ... ..	Hen. III.
Hundred Rolls } ... ..	
"Liber Rubeus" } ... ..	Ed. I.
Kirkby's Quest } ... ..	
Hundred Rolls } ... ..	Ed. III.
Knights' Fees, 31 Ed. I. } ... ..	
Book of Aids ... ..	Hen. IV.
Aid to marry ... ..	Hen. VI
Book of Knights' Fees ... ..	

The description of the Peterboro' Knights t. Hen. I. will be found on p. 168 in the Chronicle, and there is no stable relation between the Hide and Fee ; illustrations have already been given or reference made to the Barons' *Cartæ*.;\* H. R. Hen. III., Testa de Nevill, Book of Aids, and the aid to marry Hen. IV.'s daughter (Enrolled a/cs. Exch.), and the following will serve to show the rest are of like nature :

<i>Liber Rubeus</i> . Fee of Nigel de Moubray (15-25 Hen. III.)				
In Haytone ...	15	bovates	whence	12 car. make 1 fee
In Swinton, etc. 3 car.			60	" "
<i>Kirkby's Quest</i> . Honor of Richmond, Halikeld, 1284.				
Eskelby and Leeming ... ..	18	car.	make	1 fee
Uppeslunde ... ..	3		"	$\frac{1}{3}$ "
<i>Knights' Fees</i> , 31 Ed. I. Staincliffe Wap., Yorks.				
Neuton and Elslack	6	car.	whence	28 make 1 fee
Cracoe, etc ...	12		"	12 " 1 "

\* See Round's "Feudal England" (p. 294) for 2-10 Hides, per fee in 1166, and for like evidence in Chartularies (p. 295).

*Book of Knights' Fees, 6 Hen. VI. Staincliffe Wap., Yorks.*

Lord de Roos holds in				
Thornton	...	10½	car. by service of	$\frac{3}{4}$ fee
Joan, Countess of West-				
morland holds in Kettle-				
well	... ..	6	,,	,, $\frac{1}{3}$ ,,

In the 2nd extract from the Preface to the Red Book, the editor cites H. R., II., 830, where Hugh de Musgrave holds 1 Hide as  $\frac{1}{4}$  fee, which is duly found as stated but it would be singular if so vast a bulk as the Hundred Rolls could not furnish such an instance; here are a few more to be found in same Vol. II.: p. 575, 2 fees equal to  $6\frac{1}{2}$  Hides; p. 578, 1 fee to 2 Hides; p. 580,  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  Hides, also  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee to 3 Hides, p. 584,  $\frac{1}{6}$  fee to  $\frac{9}{8}$  Hides; p. 585,  $\frac{1}{6}$  fee to  $1\frac{1}{4}$  Hides, also  $\frac{1}{6}$  fee to 2 Hides; p. 336, 1 fee to 10 Hides (see "Feudal Aids" where Doddington is given as 1 fee in 1284, 1302, and 1346), also Mursele, Ro. f. Nigel,  $\frac{1}{8}$  fee to 2 Hides and more, and p. 334, 1 fee to  $5\frac{3}{4}$  Hides, which are given to show that the Hide was here a varying portion of the Fee, not touching on the point that in the H. R. it is often an areal measure or approximately so. This same extract notes a scale (where 4 Hides = 1 fee) recognised as late as the 16th century, which possibly refers to pp. 442-7 of No. 49 Surtees Soc., where is a computation as above, with an editorial note that same seems to have been compiled about the latter part of the 16th cent.; this scale also gives tables for 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, and 28 carucates per fee, not stating which of the latter is "normal." Supposing



for a moment this "normal" fee really ever did contain 4 Hides (and whether of 120 acres each as in the Preface to the Red Book or 160 each as in the L. R. itself does not much matter), as there were 6,000-7,000 fees (Hen. II. to Ed. III.), and some 67,000 Hides in say 35 counties in England in Domesday; it is evident that the Barons and Church would hardly have possessed 28,000 of them (probably less); whereas few historians should think of rating them at less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  of England, say 50,000 Hides.

With regard to the 3rd extract, which names the Sheriffs estimating Knight's fee by the hides they contained, the reference is seemingly to the Testa de Nevill, the returns from which have already been exemplified; but these remarkable instructions to the sheriffs are not found therein, nor in the "*Forma Inquisitionum de Scutagiis*," nor in the writ to the Sheriff of Hereford (both these latter on Mich. Com. 27 Hen. III. as cited on pp. 472-3 of Madox's *Exch.*, ed. 1711) nor I should imagine anywhere else than on p. clxii of aforesaid Preface; and as to the extent of the hide or carucate being "given in denominations of an acre both of arable and pasture land," anyone finding same on fo. 228 of Kirkby's *Quest* will have better luck than I had.

The case of Ramsey Abbey is certainly exceptional; but by Domesday Book that house had well over 300 Hides and Carucates, which in the language of the Exchequer (4 Hides = 1 Knight's Fee) would be the equivalent of over 70 Knights; as a matter of fact the Abbot

equipped as a rule 4 (see his Court Rolls for 1258 and 1294, in Selden Soc., Vol. II.), notwithstanding aforesaid inquisitions of 1242 estimating Knights' fees by hides (where he contributes as if he had  $33\frac{1}{3}$  fees). The uniform manufacture of Hides into fees at a rate of the "normal four" would be apt to break down in practice; suppose a Baron had a grant of 400 Hides for a service of 100 fees; he might enfeoff 100 knights\* on 350 Hides at 1 fee each (as presumably he would have some residence, and tenants in socage and villeinage), and hence (on the 4 Hide plan) the Sheriff would find not unless  $87\frac{1}{2}$  fees instead of 100; the above by way of illustration, as  $\frac{7}{8}$  of the land of a fief would (I think) be more than was usually sub-infeuded.

*Scutagium*  
and  
*Auxilium.*

The subject of escuage is I venture to think but partially understood, nor can the writer pretend to set it forth in a clear light: the author of "Feudal England" has shown how the Church was set to military service *t. Wm. I.*† (see also *Archæologia* 1863 and Steven's Royal Treasury, ed. 1725), and it is here assumed that the more important lay tenants in that reign also held by the divers duties pertaining to same. As may be seen from table (p. 55), there must have been (on the whole) a considerable balance on the dominicum *t. Hen. I.*, and the following extracts from the remaining Pipe Roll of that reign seem to apply to commutations of military service, none

\* 100 Knts., *i.e.*, a "service" of same, indefinite as to nos. and rank.

† Bigelow's *Plac. Ang. Norm.*, ed. 1879, an American work had long before borne witness on this head.‡

of which (if I have observed rightly) have been thought worthy of mention in the Government index of said vol. Some entries (p. 89) *re* the old aid of the Knights, two of them dating to the time of debtors' fathers ; (p. 132) the *gift* of the Knights of Durham Bishoprick ; (p. 153) the old aid of the Knights, of Baldwin de Redvers ; (p. 154) the like of the Bp. of Exeter ; (p. 159) the old aid of the Knights ; (p. 49) the like ; and (p. 84) the old aid of the Knights of Croyland Abbey (see also Scutage Rolls, Bdle. 11, No. 9, where in 48 Hen. III. the Abbot fines in 50 marcs). Again Knight service *t.* Hen. I. is seen in the Peterbro' Chronicle (Camd. Soc. 1849) ; a systematic commutation of lay service *at so much per fee* prior to Hen. II. seems highly probable rather than fully\* established ; the author of "Feudal England" (pp. 268-9) has given 2 references under the name of Escuage, the first\* of which is reviewed in Vol. II. Red Book Exch. (Pref. Rolls Ser.) ; Madox has given another in his most excellent History of the Exchequer† (p. 435 ed. 1711), and yet a further one may be found in Stephen's Charter to

\* The payment of £60 by the Bp. Norwich (40 fees) seems to have no connection with "the Ely contribution" (*Feudal England*, p. 270), and the reference is quite indefinite: but I consider (as a matter of *opinion*), that the entry in *Pipe Roll* 31 Hen. I., refers to a reduction of the Ely "service," memory of which is preserved in the copy of the Charter, as cited, p. 268, *Feudal England*.

† *Westminster MSS.*: Mandate of H. the King to Wm. Const. of Chester that the Monks of Westminster should hold Peritona (D. B. 247b, under that Abbey), as free from escuage, etc., as the father of said Wm. first conceded same to them.

Fountains (1135), as to the authenticity of which no comment is here made. I would here remark that altho' *auxilium* and *scutagium* present different ideas to the modern historical critic, they can sometimes be shown to be terms synonymous ; and as unfortunately the scribes of elder times were debarred from having any conception of the precise meaning of technical terms in the 20th century, latter day students might with becoming humility endeavour to attain the exact usage of words when they were written. Thus the aid to ransom Ric. I. is a Scutage in the Pipe Rolls, and quite properly so called by Alex. de Swereford : likewise the aid to marry (of 19 Hen. III.) is called both *auxilium* and *scutagium* : the writ is printed in Brady and *Select Charters* (p. 364) and reference to the Testa de Nevill will (I think) plainly demonstrate the object of the collection, and the use of either term —indeed the writ itself mentions the aid, subsequently calling same the aforesaid escuage ; and further the Scutage of Gascony is distinctly called an aid on p. 412 of the Testa de N. ; reference to the same vol. (pp. 166, 169, 257-8, 263-6, 277, 349, and 416 with 357 for W. Patric's Charter), and collation with the writ, noting the dates and tax per fee, should put the matter beyond question.

Early evidence, of feudal obligations, defective.

I do not think, there is in the Pipe Rolls existing prior to 14 Hen. II. any sufficient material to construct even an approximately complete list of the services due by the lay tenants of the Crown ; nor can I find the Exchequer had any ample guide towards assessing the aid of 1168. Now altho' the daughter of Hen. II. was not married till

1168, and the certificates are of 1166, there can be no particular improbability in supposing that the marriage of the Princess Matilda might be in contemplation prior to the former date, and also that the Crown might think it prudent to have some definite information from their lay tenants, which views are by some considered as antiquated. In 1109 Hen. I. took (Hen. de Huntingdon) 3s. per Hide to marry his daughter : if this is an exact statement, a larger sum (presuming the demesne Hides taxed), would be raised than from the tax on the fee in 1168 ; and strengthens the belief that the lay aids of Hen. I. differed considerably from the escuages Hen. II. to Hen. III. After 1166, and during the reign of Hen. II. it would appear that usually the tenant in chief either went on the expedition, compounded by substitutes or money to furnish them, or paid escuage : it is difficult to see how the heading (Pipe Roll 18 Hen. II.) *De Scutagiis militum qui nec abierunt in Hyberniam, nec milites, nec denarios illuc miserunt*\* followed by lists of capital tenants either owing or liberating into the Treasury could refer to anything else than scutage quitted at a fixed rate per fee. The editor of the Red Book (Rolls Ser.) seems to think otherwise and that the assessment (Vol. II.,

Military Service.

\* Perhaps the best evidence of early fines might be suggested from this heading, unless the "auxilium militum" of 31 Hen. I., or the promise of *servientes* (Pipe R. 11 Hen. II.), or the *dona t.* Hen. II. are regarded in that light : an instance of escuage being paid into the wardrobe at Worcester (one of the places to which the "army of Wales" was summoned) occurs on Cl. i. 572, 7 Hen. III.

p. clviii) of escuage might be to enable the lord to justice his men, which appears scarcely applicable above, nor has he cited any fines "lest they transit" in this reign. Information is needed as to the difference in obligation of church and lay barons, also to what countries the capital tenants owed to go, in what cases there was option of escuage; the obligations of the mesne tenants to their lords, as regards scutage and service, and in what fees the latter were bound to act at their own charges. The author of "Feudal England" has cited the case of the Edmondsbury tenants *t. Ric. I.*, and the course taken by the Abbot there-  
 ant; the following illustrate the feudal service of the House at Peterboro', who ought as by 60 fees:

How per-  
 formed by  
 Peterbro'  
 Abbey.

- 3 *John.* The Abbot pays 120 marcs, and owes a palfrey, for army of Normandy of *Aē* 2. (*Rot. Canc.*)
- 2 *Hen. III.* May come with 30 Knts., (Stamford), Newark (Scut. Rolls  $\frac{1}{4}$ ).
- 5 *Hen. III.* Has escuage of fees held of him—Biham (*Cl. i.* 475a).
- 7 *Hen. III.* Had 6 Knights by precept and to have  $\frac{1}{2}$  his scutage—Montgomery [ $\frac{1}{3}$  Esc. Rolls].
1229. Seems to have paid esc.—Kery: *C. Pet.*
- 1230, 14 *Hen. III.* The Abbot fines in 100 marcs and pays 180 m. of scutage, for the Brittain *exercitus*; scutage 3 m. per fee, to our 1st passage. (*Chron. Pet.*)
- 1230, 15 *Hen. III.* Pays 180 marcs scutage (*C. P.*) after first passage.
- 1235, 19 *Hen. III.* The Abbot returns 63 $\frac{1}{2}$  fees, pays on 60, and is debited for 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ . (*Testa de N.*, p. 38.)
- 29 *Hen. III.* *r. s.* 60 fees performed by 1 Knt., 8 *servientes* (*Rot. Mar.*); quit by writ of 40 fees (30 *Hen. III.*, *Pipe*); pays 60 marcs escuage (3 m. per fee, hence on 60 less 40 fees), army and scutage of Gannock (*Hist. Pet.*).
- 29 *Hen. III.* Pays 60 m. only (2 m. per fee), to the aid to marry (*Hist.*).
1264. The Abbot's Knts., joining the Barons, he pays 300 m. (and 30 m. queen gold), for defect of service, and transgression—after Lewes he has to fine with the Barons (*Hist.*; *vide etiam* p. 93 under 49 *Hen. III.*, where the entry above seems to be given in a different way).
1265. After Evesham, the Abbot pays the King 500 m., the Queen 50 m., Prince Edw. 300 m., and also to others (*Hist.*, see also note, p. 100).
- 1277, 5 *Ed. I.* The Abbot fines in 250 marcs for 5 fees, and 25 m. Queen's gold, for the first Welsh war, his tenants having declined to go except at the Abbot's costs. (*Chron. Pet.*)
- 1278, 6 *Ed. I.* The King conceded scutage at 40s. per fee, or the above war, which the Sheriff was to cause the Abbot to have. (*Chron. Pet.*)

- 1282, 10 Ed. I. The Abbot fines for the 2nd Welsh war, at the same rate as in 1277, and has acknowledgement of receipt of fine 10 Jan., 11 Ed. I. (*Chron. Pet.*)
- 1285, 13 Ed. I. The King in Parliament concedes scutage *re* above, at 40s. per fee, and the Sheriff has a writ, 7 July, 13 Ed. I. to cause Abbot to have same. (*Chron. Pet.*)
- 28 Ed. I. The Abbot fines in £200, and £20 Queen gold; Scotland (*Hist.*), for rates per fee, see pp. 94-5.
- 31 Ed. I. Fines £100, and £10 Queen gold; Scotland (*Hist.*).
- 34 Ed. I. Fines 100*m.*, and 10*m.* Queen gold (*Hist.*)
- 4 Ed. II. Fines £200 for 5 fees, and £20 Queen gold, and finds 100 *m.* of provender (for the army of Scotland), which he has to carry [*Sc. Rot.* 1<sup>3</sup>/<sub>8</sub>, and *Hist.*; see also note p. 100].
- 15 Ed. II. Gives 200 *m.* of subsidy to repress Thos., Earl Lancaster's rebellion (*Hist.*).
- 16 Ed. II. Fines in £200, and £20 Queen gold, Scotland—no general levy of escuage (*Sc. Rot.* 1<sup>3</sup>/<sub>8</sub>, and *Hist.*).
- 1 Ed. III. Fines in £100, and £10 Queen gold, Scotland (*Hist.*).
- 16 Ed. II. The Abbot fines in £200 for 5 fees (for the Scotch *exercitus* presumably)—no general levy of escuage. (*Sc. Rot.* 1<sup>3</sup>/<sub>8</sub>.)

now it will be observed that the Edwardian fines are not based on the "service," and it may also be noted the fine with escuage was under 5 *m.* per fee in 14 Hen. III., 1230, whereas it was but about £1 per fee 5 and 10 Ed. I. (by theory at least) as some 175 marcs should accrue on either occasion, as his escuage—the money received by the Crown being much the same as in 1230. The Exch. Common Roll 17 Ed. III. (cited both by Brady and Madox) gives the case of the Prior of Coventry who *t.* Ed. I., and *t.* Ed. II. fined for 2 fees (service 10); both these authors observe the Prior's Plea was false, but neither of them record judgment: certain it is many capital tenants fined just in the same way as the Prior, and it is difficult to suppose any systematic deception could have taken place with the evidence then on record in the Pipe Rolls. The charter of the Prior of Coventry to the King (aid to marry 1235) is on p. 94 of the *T. de N.*, and an inquisition of his fees in Warwick

Prior of  
Coventry's  
case.

and Leicester (p. 97) in 1242 follows; in 1166 he had  $7\frac{5}{8}$  of old and  $2\frac{1}{8}$  fees in demesne: the King's advocates either could not or would not answer the Prior's argument which appears to be entirely misapprehended by both the distinguished authors citing the case—what the Prior pleads is that he and *his tenants* paid on 10 fees to two aids to marry, and that his certificate of 1166 duly acknowledges 10 fees as by him and his tenants, but that he held by the service of 2 fees only, and challenges any recorded proof to the contrary—none produced. This probably refers to the  $2\frac{1}{8}$  fees in demesne, for which the Prior fined (*i.e.*, 2 as above), or in other words his service was 10, two of which he recognised *in exercitu* (*e.g.*, a Marshal's Roll showing the Prior had sent 10 knights would have shown the Crown to be seized of the "service" of 10 fees in the Prior's sense, but seemingly was not so found), noting that the defendant used the term "service" with a different meaning than that which is attached to it in modern writings (including this chapter). Now if the lord could compel his men always to do corporal service at their or even his own costs, he would not have paid exemplary fines, and it is certain that nothing more than scutage could be had (and that sometimes with difficulty or not at all) from some of the mesne tenants; but I have not found that it was the more *usual* practice both to fine and concede scutage to the Crown. From the Church often something more than her service seems to have been expected, but from Hen. II. to 1 Ed. III. many lay capital tenants appear to have escaped by

*Escuage*  
tenants.



paying or owing escuage. Madox in his chapter on Escuage cites (I think) but 4 cases of actual *disseisin*; such however was common enough, and no one acquainted with the records of John and Hen. III. will consider amplification needful: it may just be noted that *disseisin* was not disherison, *Disseisin.* and often appears to have been a mere formal process of taking possession on account of the unsatisfied claim of the Crown to the tenant's corporal service, or its pecuniary unpaid equivalent; the malevolence of the King being averted, and *seisin* recovered when the tenant came to terms on the matter. In and prior to Hen. I. forfeiture seems to have been frequent, but the attentive reader of History must have often observed that traitors and rebels by no means necessarily lost their estates (even temporarily), and frequently, having been disinherited, regained them in their own persons (or by their heirs)—nor must it be supposed that *disseisin*\* was the inevitable sequence of failure to attend the royal summons (bearing in mind that records do not show that half the Crown capital tenants had usually a direct summons), *e.g.*, *P. Writs* 30 Ed. I. where Jo. f. Reginald is directed to proceed against the Scots, having previously *per diversas vices* neglected to obey such summons, and again 13 Ed. II. (*P. W.*) when the King states that "very many of our realm" who should have done service in the army of his *fourth* year, neither did it, nor fined, which is to be compared with the already cited heading in Pipe 18 Hen. II., and the *nec ierant nec miserunt* of Walt. Coventry in 1213.

\* For an early instance of, see p. 105.

Obligations of under-tenants.

That the undertenant (John-Ed. II.) was more frequently of pecuniary than personal assistance seems to be supported by evidence as known—Prof. Maitland cites the legal view of a Knt. failing to do service *t. Hen. I.* (*Chron. Abingdon*, ii., 128); the Earl of Chester's Knts. are to be compelled to render him service (presumably partly or wholly of a corporal nature) in 10 John (Pat. Rot.); and a tenant's superior lord is to have full *seizin* if former is unwilling to transit for him in 14 John (*Cl. Rot.*);—nevertheless it is apparent enough that of very many mesne tenants there is no further obligation to their lord than to pay escuage, however they may stand to the Crown in the matter of fealty, as if I have rightly observed, they would be a class liable for summons amongst the *iurati ad arma*.

In the Scutage Rolls (*Chanc. Misc.*  $\frac{11}{18}$ ) in 10 Ed. III. is a mandate to the Sheriff of Yorks to cease distraint on the Luterell estates, because by the Rolls of the Marshal *t. Ed. I.* it appears that Ro. Luterell, deceased, had his service for 2 fees which he acknowledged, in 5 Ed. I. in the 1st Welsh war; hence it appears that the Scutage due in 1278 was still owing to the Crown in 1316-17,\*

Inadequacy of Scutage entries in Pipe Rolls, *t. Ed. I.*

\* It seems clear that the notes as to tenants in 1278 (*Pipe Roll* 7 Ed. I. *Ebor.*) are indefinite, as some had, and others had not done service in the war of 5 Ed. I., but Ric. de Malebisse who had been summoned to perform military service in person (Muster at Worcester 5 Ed. I.) does not acknowledge nor fine for same, but is noted in the 7 Ed. I. Pipe Roll, as paying 40s. scutage for 1 fee (which was held of the Hon. of Eye). Again Peter de Mauley did his service,

and further that when Scutage was assized, it might be collected either for the tenant or the King. Turning to the Pipe Roll 7 Ed. I. Yorks, the Scutage of Wales was assized at 40s. (£20 seems to have been actually paid then) whereof Ro. Luterell is noted with £25 for 12½ fees, with a reference to the last Welsh Scutage, *i.e.*, 42 Hen. III. at a similar rate : the names seem to have been copied from a former roll or rolls with alterations of Christian names (thus Ro. Luterell succeeded in 5 Ed. I., his grandfather Andrew being tenant in 42 Hen. III.), and hence in 10 Ed. III. it might well appear that the executors of the said Ro. stood charged with the Escuage of 1278. Now it may be remarked that the Luterell property ought the

Double meaning of "Service," illustrated by the Luterell case.

acknowledging 2 fees, (appearing in person with another Knight at the Muster at Rhuddlan 10 Ed. I.): nevertheless both in the Pipe Rolls of 10 and 14 Ed. II. he is debited with £63 scutage for that particular campaign : his service being 31½ fees, as he inherited the estates of Wm. Forsard who rendered that number (Pipe Roll 14 Hen. II., *Ebor.*). Most of those capital tenants specially summoned for the 5 Ed. I. Welsh war, from Yorkshire [unlike the total for England, where about half of all specially warned neither come, send, nor fine—*Marshal's* Roll 1277] fine, or "make," or "have," but there are no writs of quittance noted on the Pipe Rolls of 5, 6, or 7 Ed. I. *re* this army; that King however seems not to have effectively pressed the collection of escuage (see Parl. Writs *t.* Ed. II.), and as shown in the Luterell case, such was being collected in 10 Ed. III. Edward II. collected or attempted to collect the escuages of Ed. I.—most of the Yorkshire entries (Pipe Rolls 7 and 13 Ed. I.) give no further information than the number of fees each tenant had (the Welsh war of 10 Ed. I. is the last of which any regular entry of escuage is made for this county), and could be but of slight use as a guide to what was due to the Crown.

service of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  fees and recognised such by 2 knights in the King's army, and that said fees were those for which Ro. de Gant sent in a Charter in 1166; in 1168 (being one of the eleven exceptions) he rendered 17, but paid then on  $12\frac{1}{2}$  only, and is not on the rolls till 2 Ric. I. when the fee is given as  $12\frac{1}{2}$  (see p. 77 "Red Book" Vol. I., likewise in 6 and 8 Ric. I., 1 and 13 John), also 38 Hen. III. where account is rendered by the Sheriff of £25 of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  fees of Andrew Luterel, of Maurice de Gaunt, in the aid to Knight Prince Edward.

The following illustrations save where otherwise stated are from Madox's "Hist. of the Exchequer":

Examples  
from  
Madox,  
etc.

- 18 Hen. II. Glastonbury Abbey in the hands of the King : therefore unrecognised fees paid.
- 7 Ric. I. Ro. de. St. John *r.c.* 15 marcs, lest he transit, and to have escuage of 1 fee.
- 7 Ric. I. Matilda Countess of Warwick *r.c.* 40 *m.*, lest she send Knights o'er sea, and to have escuage of 15 fees. [Scutage £1 per fee.]
- 8 Ric. I. Bp. Coventry *r.c.* £25 lest etc., and to have escuage of 15 fees of the Bp. and 10 of the Priory [seems an even fine].
- 1 John. Ro. de Turevil *r.c.* 5 *m.* for  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee which he holds in demesne, lest he *transfret* with horses and arms.
- 1 John. Hen. de Witefeld owes 4 *m.* lest etc., who holds  $\frac{1}{4}$  fee in demesne.
- 1 John. Geoff. de Mandeville who holds in demesne 1 fee *r.c.* £5 lest etc., and to have scutage of said demesne.
- 3 John. Ric. Descrupes owes £5 for 3 fees, lest, etc.
- 12 John. Earl Clare *r.c.* 500 *m.* for his passage, Ireland, (and is quit of escuage, *Pipe* 13 John).
- 14 Hen. III. Fines and Scutages (3 marcs per fee) for the King's first passage to Brittany:  
Abbot Evesham *r.c.* £20 for passage, and for scutage of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  fees

- Abbot Pershore *r.c.* £10 for passage, and for scutage of 2 fees.
- Abbot Abbotsbury *r.c.* £5 for passage, and for scutage of 1 fee.
- Abbot Westminster *r.c.* 100 marcs of fine for scutage of 15 fees.
- Abbot Michelney *r.c.* 3 *m.* by the Sheriff for 1 fee.
- Abbot Cerne *r.c.* £5 for passage and scutage of 1 fee ; *r.c.* £2 of scutage of 1 fee, for which he did not fine.
- Bp. of Bath (20 fees) gave £120 of aid, partly pardoned.
- Prior of Coventry *r.c.* 35 *m.* for his passage and to have escuage of his 10 fees.
- Ro. de *Novo Burgo r.c.* 20 *m.* for his passage, saving to the King, scutage of his 15 fees.
- 18 *Hen. III.* The Bp. London *r.c.* 60 *m.* of fine to be quit of sending Knights, and to have his escuage, and should the King pardon scutage to any of the Bp's Knights, same to be allowed for in the fine [20 fees].
- 20 *Hen. III.* *Re* exceptional grant by ecclesiastics of an aid of 2 marcs per fee as well those usually answerable to escuage, as others retained to their own use ; not to be prejudicial on future occasions ; (refers to the aid to marry, and is from record citing it).
- 27 *Hen. III.* Receipt of 50 marcs subsidy of the Abbot of Hyde in consideration of which he will respond for escuage of 15 instead of 20 fees.
- 7 *Ed. I.* The Bp. Lincoln fines in £80 for 5 fees (service 60) which he recognised for 1<sup>st</sup> Welsh war.\*
- 7 *Ed. I.* Order to levy scutage of 40s. per fee from capital tenants, etc., *re* above.
- 27 *Ed. I.* 2 cases of quittance of escuage of capital tenants for army of 5 *Ed. I.* who respectively "had," and fined for service : (*Lancs. Lay Sub.*).
- 31 *Ed. I.* (Brady Vol. I. Hist. p. 120) *Hen. de Perci* who was in the Scotch expedition of 31 *Ed. I.*, to have £2 per fee scutage.
- 31 *Ed. I.* (Brady, *ibid.*) *Hen. de Lacy* to have £2 from each

\* *Hist. Exch.*, p. 460, *ed.* 1711 ; *cf.* Peterboro' Abbey, 5 *Ed. I.*, already cited, p. 84.

of his fees, as he was in the King's service negotiating in France, during the *exercitus* of 31 Ed. I.

34 Ed. I. Similar order to last, *re* Scotch expedition.

9 Ed. II. 4 cases of distraint of escuage on mesne tenants for armies of 28, 31, and 34 Ed. I.; mandate that same should cease, unless at aforesaid time the lord of said mesnes was within age, and in the King's hands.

9-12 Ed. II. Two cases showing that in this reign the tenant of an honour was bound to give scutage, but not to do corporal service.

10 Ed. II. Debts of Scotch expeditions of 28, 31, and 34 Ed. I. to be collected at the rate of £2 per fee as scutage, and enquiry as to capital tenants, escheats, honors, perquisites, wards, and vacant ecclesiastical holdings—reference to above in a mandate to the Commissioners.

15 Ed. II. Summons for an expedition against the Scots, in which ecclesiastics, widows, and other women are to be allowed to *fine* at £40 per *fee*.

20 Ed. III. (Brady, Vol. I. App. pp. 86-8) Expenses of the army of this year, showing its composition, wages, etc., (a Knight 2s. per day).

Payment  
of Scutage.

Now it seems clear that it was easier to pay Escuage than to fine, and certain tenants appear to have escaped by the former plan: why some should stand as quit paying or owing scutage is difficult to discern, further than on such general grounds as expediency, negligence, favoritism, relative strength of the Crown, abilities of tenants, etc., bearing in mind that wards, escheats, perquisites, honors, and vacant bishopricks explain the matter in many (but certainly not all) cases. The following references are mainly from original matter at the Record Office, dealing with the final period (up to 1 Ed. III.) beyond which I do not find any notice of a general levy of scutage in England; as

Madox's Hist. Exch. and Parl. Writs (the only works assaying satisfactory illustration), do not bring the History of Escuage quite to a close :

- 29 *Hen. III.* Aid granted 1242, £1 per fee, to marry the King's daughter noted for Yorks in the Pipe Roll, on basis of render of 1168. Examples from MSS., mostly unprinted.
- 38 *Hen. III.* Aid to knight Prince Edward, noted on Pipe Roll, at £2 per fee, generally on same basis as above though theoretically on "old" and "new" feoffment.
- 42 *Hen. III.* Escuage for Welsh war, at 40s. per fee, noted for Yorks on Pipe Roll, same basis as above, *i.e.*, render of 1168.
- 49 *Hen. III.* Chanc. Misc. *Bdle II, No. 9.* Fines for services due to the King in his army *anno* 48 ; totalling £1,302 10s. ; (c. 68 entries) thus :
- |   |        |     |        |
|---|--------|-----|--------|
| Abbot Glastonbury                                   | ...    | 60  | marcs. |
| „ Abingdon  | ... .. | 60  | „      |
| „ Hyde  | ... .. | 50  | „      |
| „ Croyland  | ... .. | 50  | „      |
| Thos. Kyn'  | ... .. | 40  | „      |
| Chapter of Lincoln                                  | ... .. | 40  | „      |
| Bp. Salisbury                                       | ... .. | 50  | „      |
| Bp. Durham  | ... .. | 100 | „      |
| Abb. Peterbro' (as well for service as of his gift) | ... .. | 300 | „      |
- 5 *Ed. I.* (Chanc. Misc.  $\frac{11}{18}$ ) Order to Sheriff of Yorks in 10 *Ed. III.*, to release distraint on Luterell estates for scutage of 5 *Ed. I.*, as Ro. Luterell dec<sup>d</sup> then had his service for 2 fees.
- 7 *Ed. I.* Scutage of Wales assised at 40s. per fee with reference to 42 *Hen. III.* ; a list of most of the Yorkshire capital tenants, some of whom fined, *had* or *did* service, but nothing to indicate this on the roll, the names being proper to 7 *Ed. I.*, and not to 42 *Hen. III.* ; £20 paid ; the fees on basis of 1168.
- 10 *Ed. I.* ( $\frac{11}{9}$  *Sc. Rot.*) Fines for army of Wales ; c. 90 entries.
- 14 *Ed. I.* Another list, presumably of the second Welsh war, on same basis as 7 *Ed. I.* ; both Yorks *Pipe Rolls*.

- 28 Ed. I. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  Sc. Rot.) Fines for army of Scotland, at 40 li. per fee—total £1,975 6s. 8d. in c. 15 entries.
- 28, 31, 34 Ed. I. *Lay Subs.*,  $\frac{141}{1}$ . Collection of escuage (Middlesex) at the rate of 40s. per fee for the armies summoned for Carlisle (28 Ed. I.), Berwick-on-Tweed (31 Ed. I.) and Carlisle (34 Ed. I.), seemingly paid by undertenants.
- 28 and 34 Ed. I. King's writ in 4 Ed. III. to the Sheriff of Westmorland that the executors of Marmaduke Twenge deceased (who was with the lord Edward grandfather of the now King in the Scotch expeditions) should have scutage, at 40s. per fee, both for 28 and 34 Ed. I.
- 31 Ed. I. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  Sc. Rot.) Fines for Berwick army at 20 li. per fee—total £1,777 1s. 8d. in c. 32 entries—thus Archbp. of York (service 20), £100 for 5 fees.
- 34 Ed. I. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  Sc. Rot.) Fines for Carlisle army at 20 marcs per fee—total £1,881 os. 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or more, in c. 69 entries.
- 34 Ed. I. (*Chanc. Misc.*  $\frac{11}{18}$ ) Writ in 5 Ed. III., that whereas Wm. la Zouche fined for his service in Scotland 34 Ed. I., said Wm. to have scutage at the rate of 40s. per fee.
- 34 Ed. I. (*Yorks Pipe Roll*) The Archbp. York fines in 100 marcs for 5 fees which he recognises: notes of presumed debts of Welsh scutage.
- 35 Ed. I., 1 Ed. II. Like entries as to Welsh scutage on *Yorks Pipe Roll*.
- 4 Ed. II. (*Chanc. Misc.*  $\frac{11}{18}$ ) Writ of 2 Ed. III. to the Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex to the effect that, whereas our father (Ed. II.) by divers writs, commanded that our beloved Abbot of Hyde, who had his service in Scotland (4 Ed. II.), etc., should have escuage at the rate of 2 marcs per fee, and that as said Abbot has informed us that same has not been levied, etc.—to cause said Abbot to have, etc.
- 4 Ed. II. (*ibid.*) Writ in 4 Ed. III. to the Sheriff of Lancs that executors of Marm. de Twenge deceased, should have escuage.
- 4 Ed. II. (*ibid.*) Writ in 5 Ed. III. to Sheriff of Somerset to cause Wm. la Zouche to have escuage *re* 4 Ed. II.



- 4 Ed. II (*Subs.*  $\frac{91}{8}$ ) Derby ; collectors' accounts of escuage, presumably from undertenants, at the rate of 2 marcs per fee.
- 4 Ed. II. (*Sc. Rot.*  $\frac{11}{9}$ ) 9 entries of fines at £40 *per fee* for army of Scotland.
- 6 Ed. II. (*ibid.*) Fines for respite from service ; *c.* 52 entries.
- 6-7 Ed. II. (*Chanc. Misc. Bdle.* 11, No. 9) Fines thus : Jollan de Nevill 40s. for respite of service due from 1 fee till the Nativity of St. John the Baptist : Aucher *f.* Hen. recognises the service of  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee, and makes fine (*see P. W.*).
- 7 Ed. II. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  *Sc. Rot.*) Fines for army of Berwick, at 20 marcs per fee ; *c.* 40 entries.
- 8-11 Ed. II. (*Chanc. Misc. Bdle.* 11, No. 15) Roger de Mortimer, who was with the King, etc., to have his scutage.
- 10 Ed. II. (*Yorks Pipe Roll*) Notes of presumed debts of 2 Welsh scutages of Ed. I. ; Geoff. Luterell pays £25 for 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  fees, for the 2<sup>nd</sup> scutage, for his father deceased ; it is interesting to note that Ro. Luterel acknowledged 2 fees in 5 Ed. I., and did his service ; in 10 Ed. I. he was summoned, and clearly seems not to have appeared nor fined (there are many writs *t.* Ed. II. stating that as tenant had fined he is not to be distrained for scutage, *or* to have his escuage), his son paying the scutage on 12 $\frac{1}{2}$  (not 2) fees, 35 years later.
- 13 Ed. II. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  *Sc. Rot.*) 5 fines for army of York at £20 *per fee*.
- 14 Ed. II. (*Yorks Pipe Roll*) Entries of presumed debts of escuage for the 2 Welsh wars of the last reign, on basis of 1168.
- 16 Ed. II. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  *Sc. Rot.*) £580 fines for army of Newcastle at £40 *per fee* :

			£
Bp. Bath and Wells ...	...	...	80
„ Chichester ...	...	...	100
„ Winchester ...	...	...	200
Abbot Peterbro' ...	...	...	200

1, 2, 3 Ed. III. No entries as to escuage found on *Yorks Pipe Roll*.

- 1 Ed. III. (*Chanc. Misc.*  $\frac{11}{18}$ ) Writ of 11 Ed. III. to Sheriff of Somerset to cause Abbot of Glastonbury to have his scutage for fine made for service in Scotland 1 Ed. III.
- 1 Ed. III. (*Subs.*  $\frac{202}{38}$ ) Account of collectors of the E.R. Yorks (in or after 13 Ed. III.) as to escuage of 1 Ed. III., showing that nothing had been levied, the King having stopped levying till further demand.
- 1 Ed. III. ( $\frac{11}{9}$  *Sc. Rot.*) £778 fines for army of Newcastle, at £20 per fee; in c. 26 entries.
- 12 Ed. III. (*Jones' Index*, citing *Hil.* 12 Ed. III. *Mem.*) Jo. f. Ro. de Ros to be attached for view of account of scutage.
- 12 Ed. III. *L.T.R. Mem.* Commission to collect scutage of 1 Ed. III.
- 12 Ed. III. *Fædera.* To defer collection of above scutage till further orders (1338).
- 20 Ed. III. (*Chanc. Misc.* Bdle 11. No. 19) Fines thus: Ric. de Goldesbrough *miles*, for 5 marcs for expenses of 1 hobelar; Humph. de Bassingbourn *miles* 26 m. for expenses of 2 men at arms and 1 hobelar—but no note of fees, being assessed on value p. a. of land or rents, commencing at £5 (one archer).
- 9 Ric. II. Parl. Roll. Petition (granted) that no escuage shall be challengeable on account of the King's 1<sup>st</sup> expedition to Scotland.
1372. (*Fædera*). The Irish Exch. Barons not to exact scutage from persons whose possessions are held by the rebels.

its extinction in the 17th century.

There is no evidence of any general levy of escuage (*ut credo*), in England, after 1. Ed. III., but there is not infrequent mention of it in the Rolls of Parliament, and some evidence of its existence as a rent charge\*—however scutage was not abolished in 1641, when the House of Com-

\* *Inter alia*: Wm. Angevyn held  $\frac{1}{2}$  the Manor of Hebden of the Abbot of Fountains by homage, fealty, scutage, and a rent of 8s. p. a.—I.P.M. 15 Hen. VII.

mons were to take it into consideration, possibly in alarm lest it might be utilised to meet the exigencies of their unfortunate monarch, who is reported to have been benefited to the extent of £100,000, or £173,537 9s. 6d., by the compositions for Knighthood of the 40 librate holders.\*

The popular idea of the *servitium debitum* is clearly stated by J. A. C. Vincent (*Lancs. Lay Subs.*, p. 116), in his expansion of a writ of military summons, to wit, *in the proportion of one Knight to each fee*, whereas the mandate requires *habeant ibi pro se servicium suum nobis debitum*;—the simplicity of a theory asking credence for the muster of the whole Knight Service of the kingdom to a particular place on a given day one very much admires at. Like views appear to be expressed in *Feudal England* (pp. 270-1, J. H. Round), and p. 292 where that author labours hard to equate a scutage of 2 *marcs* per fee with the service of a Knight for 40 days; in the excellent work of the Bishop of Oxford (*Const. Hist.* i. 589);† and also in *The Scutage and*

Popular theory of service in exercitu.

Unanimity of authors there-  
anent.

\* Archæologia, 1863.

† It would of course be impossible for any author to fathom every detail in so vast and laborious a work as that under note; at the same time a levy of one-third of the *milites by tenure*, would be (I think), as large a proportion as ever recorded; the chronicler himself styles it *maximam expeditionem, ita ut duo milites de tota Anglia tertium pararent ad opprimendum Galenses* (*Chron. Norm.* p. 993, Duchesne), and it must be remembered that King John, when raising the country to resist invasion, ordered *quod novem milites per totam Angliam invenient decimum militem*, and in 4 northern counties a portion of this quota ( $\frac{1}{10}$ ) was to be retained to guard their

Quotas of service.

*Knight Service in England* (p. 108, J. F. Baldwin), which is perhaps the best modern work on the feudal system of this country.

Army of  
Calais,  
A.D. 1346.

Certain it is the Abbots of Evesham, Ramsey, and St. Albans, and the Bishop of Durham did all, and sometimes more (the two latter) than the same service for which they responded to escuage—but what evidence remains (by no means inconsiderable), demonstrates that most of the ecclesiastics and laymen did very much less. At the siege of Calais (when conditions had entirely changed), there were perhaps at most\* 1,063 English Earls, Bannerets, and Knights, with some 3,000 esquires (in feudal language *c.* 2,500 fees), all at wages [*vide MS. Harl.* 3,968, which is fuller than the *Heralds' Coll.* copy printed in *Creci and Calais*]; and a professional writer [the Hon. Gen.

own parts (*Pat. Rot.* 6 John). The same author (Ro. de Monte, *ut sup. Chron. Norm.*) gives the interesting reference (*vide Duchesne*, 995), cited in *Feudal England* (p. 280) whose author suggests the chronicler is at fault, as the escuage represented but a minority of the fees: the available records do not demonstrate that at this period the Exchequer were seized of any evidences which would enable its Barons to form a competent conception of the number of fees held by the lay Crown tenants; it would seem probable that many records perished *t.* Stephen, as when ancient evidences are called for of a general nature, the Crown instructs its officers to produce Domesday Book, and the Barons' Certificates, so that apparently these were all the records to hand.

\* This estimate of course includes all the English *men at arms* present whether Crown tenants or not: some of them presumably had no landed property whatsoever—cf. *chescun Esquier nient possessionez des terres, rent, ne chateaux, q'est en service ou ad este armez* [2 Ric. II.].

Wrottesley], states this to have been the most complete expedition despatched from England till the 19th century.

In 14 Hen. II. and 38 Hen. III. are some 11 and 9 cases of services of upwards of 100 fees (to escuage), and yet one thinks the authors of the accepted theory of all the feudal *milites*\* doing service together in the same army would be particularly distressed to *prove* an actual service in the army of 20 fees even in 5 cases, or of 40, 50, or 100 fees in any single case whatsoever: 40 may have been a possible number, as the Earl of Salisbury allows such to be his debt *in exercitu* in 1166 (fees to scutage 56 $\frac{4}{5}$  and 55 $\frac{1}{4}$ , 18 Hen. II. and 38 Hen. III.)—but the Baronial Charters themselves often furnish undeniable witness that the services are of divers natures. There is fairly ample evidence as to the armies of John and Hen. III., and no lack of same *t. Ed. I.–II.*, and in no case† (*ut videtur mihi*) anything approaching 20 *milites* by any baron; nor is it likely that (in the earlier period) all the feudal *milites* could have been entirely withdrawn from the Castles, especially on the Welsh and Scotch borders, thus

Supposed  
“services,”  
of more  
than 100  
Knights.

Popular  
theory of  
Knight  
Service im-  
probable  
*per se*, and  
lacking  
support of  
Records.

\* *Milites*—a difficult term, Wm. I. to Hen. II., and scarcely quite equivalent to the same *t. Ed. I.*; in 38 Hen. III. the Bannerets and Bachelors by *tenure* might total 1,000, or *possibly* 1,500;—*t. Ed. I.* there is evidence of a considerable force, including the *vadlets*, *servientes*, or *esquires*, but by far the more part of same *ad vadia nostra*.

† Earl Richard (89 fees *et amplius*) led 20 *milites* and 40 *servientes* (probably archers on foot for the more part) in the army of Wales, (*Pipe Roll*, 11 Hen. II.).

depriving the land of its natural leaders, and tending to place the much decried (C. Oman, M.A., *Art of War*, and Prize College Essay) abilities of our mediæval *capitanei*, more nearly on a level with those of their modern critics.

Now true it is that the wages\* of a *miles* for

Expenses  
of military  
service.

\* The siege of Kenilworth is said to have lasted from June 25 to Dec. 13, 1266 (*Const. Hist.*, ii. 96), and the Abbot of Peterboro' (as other prelates), was summoned for his service (at this period the equivalent of 5 Knts.); the expedition seems to have cost him £124-5 (*Hist. Pet.*), but no definite dates occur save 3 weeks after Aug. 24, and 15 days after Nov. 1—amongst the items are 17 horses *deprædati de pretio* £40, and 10 *loricæ cum toto apparatu de pretio* £15. Later at Shrewsbury are entries of the expenses of brother Wm. Paris, *cum toto servitio*, for 6 weeks, £14 18s. od., and in purchase and repairs of arms £6 14s. od.; in 4 *Ed. II.* the King wrote to the Abbot (*vide Hist.*) for his service for Scotland (suppose 5 *miles*) whereupon he sent him Wm. de la Zouche (*miles*), with horses and arms, at a cost exceeding 60 *marcs*, but *nihil placuit regi*, so the Abbey fines for 5 fees in £200, etc. (see p. 85). The cost of a hired Knt. would to some extent be regulated by the fines to the Crown, to knowledge of which the contracting parties could be no strangers—thus in 1284, the Abbot of St. Augustine's (scutage service, 15) arranged with Wm. de Cobeham (*miles*), to quit them of all military service due to the Crown (*sc. 1 Knt. in exercitu*, see *Rot. Mar.* 10 *Ed. I.*, and *Chron. W. Thorn*), for £20. As the fines for this army (Wales) were 50 m. per fee (queen gold 5 m.), it is evident the Abbey saved £16 13s. 4d. by the above pact, but it should be noted that the liabilities (ransom, loss or injury to horses, etc.) of the service would probably fall on Wm. de Cobeham. The wages of a *miles* at this period were 2s. a day, and apparently rather a mere average equivalent for housing, and provender, in time of war for himself, his *vadlets*, and horses—the King's household and hired Knts. being at the

Bargains  
with hired  
Knights;  
actual case  
in 1284,  
between  
tenant and  
*miles*.

40 days at 8d. per day, would be met by an escuage of 2 *m.* per fee, upon which it may be observed, (a), that the duration of service *t. Hen. II.* <sup>Wages of a Knight, *t. Hen. II.*</sup> (*ut videtur mihi*), is not clearly proven; (b), that 8d. might perhaps on the average defray the daily cost of a *miles*, 2-3 horses, and an attendant or attendants; (c), that it would seem to leave no surplus for casualties—*e.g.* loss of horses, and expenses to and from the place of muster; and (d) that 2 *m.* is the highest scutage, and 8d. the lowest wage *t. Hen. II.*, 1 *m.* and 1s. (wage) being also recorded. Further the conventions between *Hen. I.* and *Robt. Earl of Flanders (1101-3)* <sup>Flemish Conventions, *t. Hen. I.*</sup> demonstrate that not only did the King agree to pay journeys to and fro, find board and food (*ut credo*, the equivalent of the customary wages), but also to defray all losses, as was customary with the *milites* of his own household: in addition the Earl was to have an annual retainer of 400 *marcs*, for 1,000 *milites* in England (in case of need), for an undefined period, each *miles* to bring 3 horses.\* The editor of the *Red Book Exch.* (*L. R.* vol. ii.) rates the expenses of Knight Service at 3<sup>es</sup> the escuage, but *ut supra*, no proof

Crown's risk as to losses, and in some cases (at any rate), wearing the royal livery, but it seems clear that the liabilities to losses from service *by tenure* would be taken by the tenants themselves.

\* *Fædera*; 500 *milites* in 1101, and 1,000 in 1103; see also *Pipe* 31 *Hen. I.*, where is some slight evidence for supposing the wage of a Knight in a Castle to be 4d. a day (p. 137 *ut sup.*), and *vide Chron. Pet. App.* (p. 175) where *Vivian (t. Hen. I.)* ought to be a *miles in exercitu cum ij equis, et suis armis, et abbas inveniet ei alia necessaria.*

Term of  
Service.

Presta-  
tions.

Army of  
Ireland,  
1211.

(under correction) of time has yet been advanced as to the earlier period in England; Prof. Maitland remarking this has given the useful reference to a *certain* term (*Rot. Cl.* 14 John, p. 117*b*), but at the same time it is to be allowed that 40 days is not infrequently named in connexion with small serjeanties and the *iurati ad arma*, and clearly for Knight Service in Normandy *t.* Hen. I., (Bp. Bayeux' fees). Nevertheless it seems almost demonstrable that in 1211 (12 John) certain feudal tenants served far beyond that period; the royal army being at Pembroke, 16 June; Waterford, 20 June; Dublin, 24 August; and Fishguard (Wales) 2 days later: in this expedition the 1st general prest to feudal tenants was made at Pembroke, 16 June, and the last notable ones at Dublin, 21 August, to some 332 *milites*, and to *c.* 116 more next day: altho' many of these advances (to *milites*) are indefinite, some, up to the close of the period, are stated to be on their demesne (or that of their lord),—in the case of Flemish Knights, on their fees. It may be remarked that Earl David (Hunts) had an advance (prest) as late as Aug. 24, and that in 14 Hen. III. (Bain's *Scotch Cal.* citing *L. T. R. Mem.*) his successor Earl John accounts for and is pardoned £80 of the prest of Ireland *t.* John—the former Earl had 10 *milites* in the Irish army, likewise the Earls of Hereford and Essex (the Justiciar), but this is the highest number there recorded: \* in

\* It should be scarcely necessary to observe these Earls had more than 10 fees each—prests occur in the Pipe Roll 31 Hen. I. as being accounted for at the Exch., and it is



the reigns of Ed. I. and II. it is certain that 40 days is the accredited term, and appears to have been in 50 Hen. III. (*Pat. Rot.*) when 5 northern Barons are acquitted of further service on that ground. <sup>40 days.</sup>

The Inquisitions of Normandy (1177-1189) perhaps show a service to the King of *c.* 652 fees from a total of *c.* 1,830 fees [the record gives 581 from *c.* 1500,] some of the royal service being in castleguard—in either case about a third of the total, the balance presumably serving *in nummis*, and guarding the baronial castles, which in a certain sense are those of the King and Duke [Hen. II.]: the earlier return of the Bishop of Bayeux is similar, 40 knights doing service 40 days (to Hen. I.), for 120 fees.\* <sup>Normandy Inquisitions.</sup>

The massed capital (*c.* 1400) and undertenants (7,871, *Ellis*), in D. B. yield 9,271 *in toto*; of these most of the immediate and many of the mediate ones can in no sense be regarded as holding by Knight Service: the number of *milites* (Ellis) is 137, but this is a most delusive return; <sup>Milites in Domesday.</sup>

clear that some had been made to English *milites* for the army of Normandy, 2 *John* (*Rot. Canc.* 3 John).

\* The whole service due to the Duke is here stated as 774 *milites* [*Feudal England*, p. 292, citing date as 1171, and *Liber Rubeus*, vol. ii., p. 647, under date *c.* 1133, noting that the total (774) is *not* in the original], but this seems to have been an error of the transcriber, produced perhaps by adding the service (*c.* 652) of *t.* Hen. II. (including the Bayeux fees) to the latter total (120) *t.* Hen. I.: it may be noted that the Bishop had 120 fees at either date *ad servitium suum*, and is returned as owing 40 *milites* to the Duke *t.* Hen. I., and 20 *t.* Hen. II.

as "Knights" occur also amongst the capital and undertenants: there are certainly upwards of 700 (it is impracticable to distinguish duplicates) men, to whom D. B., directly or indirectly applies this term (and many more of course of the class, not specified otherwise than by the baptismal or gentilitial names), but some of these are in no sense of the term "Knights," as obviously the *dominæ* do not militate, nor presumably does Wennenc, the priest [D. B., i., 18a, *bis vel amplius*], included (I think), amongst Earl Eu's *milites*.

The term therefore in its collective usage may include mere tenants by military service, who cannot be "Knights"; the same application is often to be remarked in the Baronial certificates (including *dominæ*, *monachi*, etc.), of 1166, which yield some 4,000 names,  $\frac{2}{5}$  of which hold less than 1 fee; some of these are entered more than once, and on the other hand the returns are neither definite nor complete: Simon de Beauchamp's charter names 85 tenants on  $36\frac{3}{5}$  old fees, and if read (by the letter), informs of an aid on the fee *t. Hen. I.* (*i.e.*, scutage in nature, if not in name),—that all his tenants were *milites t. Hen. I.* or *t. Hen. II.* is improbable.

*Auxilium,*  
*t. Hen. I.*

The Assize of Arms\* (1181) *ut videtur mihi*, affects for the more part tenants by Knight Service;

\* It is presumed that few tenants other than military, and townsmen, would *t. Hen. II.* be assessed at 10 *marcates* of land or goods; the exceptions perhaps would be tenants in fee farm, retainers attached to important households, and perhaps a few tenants by socage on the ecclesiastical estates, allowing always for considerable intermixture of tenure. The Assize *t. John*, names tenants of  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee, [some of them perhaps equestrian *servientes*]; most of the Yorkshire subsidy men

(a), 1 fee or more; (b), 16 *marcates* of land or goods—say  $\frac{1}{2}$  fee; (c), 10 *marcates* of land or goods—say  $\frac{1}{3}$  fee; (d), all burgesses and *tota communa liberorum hominum* allowing (d) to include those holding other than by Knight Service, and in exceptional cases (b) and (c), and supposing the above classes to furnish the cavalry and heavy armed infantry *t. Hen. II.*, and that the *villani* were not to be permitted to have the furniture of freemen.

Assize of Arms,  
*t. Hen. II.*

The author of *The Art of War* lays much stress on the absence of bows and arrows, which is little to the purpose, as the assize *t. John* (*vide Rot. Cl.* 14 Hen. III., p. 1, m. 6<sup>d</sup>) is quite definite on that point—in addition, these weapons are named in the Laws of Hen. I., and it is incredible to hold that the community of chroniclers of divers ages had entered into a pact for a systematic deception of the moderns on that head, and *vide also Pipe Rolls t. Hen. II.* as to archers and arrows.

Alleged  
decay of  
Archery.

*Ordericus Vitalis* mentions *feudum militis* as quite early in the 11th cent., thus, *Præfatus Decanus ex discipulis Fulberti Carnotensis Episcopi fuit, et ex paterna hereditate feudum militis possedit* with reference to Dean Fulc, whom he terms *silicernius t. Mainerius* (1066–1089), and further (as to military ecclesiastics) continues, *Deinde Presbyteri de stirpe Dacorum litteris tenuiter edocti parrochias tenebant, et arma ferentes laicalem feudum militari famulatu defendebant*—whether or not the Dean of Evreux was classed as a *miles*

*Feudum militis* of  
Normandy,  
11th  
century.

[25 Ed. I., No. 16, *Yorks Rec. Ser.*], are rated at less than 20s. of goods, but it is allowed that mediæval assessments are of a formal nature.

is left indefinite ; but certain it seems the feudal tenure of Normandy, as portrayed by that author, was the antecessor of that introduced into England.

*Milites of  
Peterboro',  
t. Hen. I.*

Just as some of the *milites* of D. B. and 1166 are demonstrably and presumably not "Knights," so also in the return of the *milites* of the Abbot of Peterboro' (*Chron. Pet. t. Hen. I.*) occur *sochemanni et serviunt cum militibus*, but it would be hard to credit their appearance as "Knights" *habentes equos, et loricas, et cassides, et clypeos, et lanceas, in exercitu*, tho' they might very well serve *in nummis*.

*Service of  
Evesham  
Abbey, in  
exercitu.*

Without falling back on the writ described as *startling* in *Feudal England* (p. 303); the writ, p. 304, *ibid.*, and also in Ellis' *Introd. to D. B.*, vol. ii. (p. 447, ed. 1833) in which the Abbot of Evesham is ordered to lead 5 *milites* [in his charter 4½, and ½ fee new; returns 4½ fees for scutage (aid) 14 Hen. II., and 38 Hen. III., and recognizes the service of as many *in exercitu*, 5 Ed. I., and 4 Ed. II.], there is no refusing\* the conclusion

*The pre-  
decessor of  
Ranulf  
Flambard  
disseised  
for defect  
of service,  
etc.*

\* The statement that Ranulf Flambard (Bp. Durham), devised feudal service, can obtain but little beyond our halls of learning, for his predecessor temporarily lost that Bp.rick (1088), in that, after *oral* summons he withdrew himself, and his *milites*, in the King's necessity, *etc.*: this was Bp. Wm. *sancti Carilefi* [the *American Plac. Ang. Norm.*, ed. 1879, cites the case, giving reference, but not identifying the prelate, but *vide* Simeon of Durham], whom Lanfranc proposed to treat after the manner of Bp. Odo *t. Wm. I.* Indeed strictly contemporary evidence (*Hist. Eccl. Dun.*, written there) renders it clear that Bp. Walcher's neglect in restraining his *milites* led to his death in 1080: it may be suggested that A.S. history would yield a more suitable range for the *Ymagines Historiarum* of the romantic school, as furnishing for *speculative genius* a scope both ample and comparatively secure.

that certain capital tenants enfeoffed *milites* *t.* Wm. I., and hence themselves had been infeuded for their homage and service.

This is of course not to say that Wm. I. had generally enfeoffed his military tenants by the service of bringing all their *milites* to his armies in England and Normandy, for, the office of holding the former by maintaining his castles, and those of his barons seems to have been a more essential one; and, that the *servitia debita* were divers [tho' uniform as far as regards escuage and aid—saving the small fees of Moreton], is plainly to be discovered both from the Norman Inquisitions [*t.* Hen. I. and Hen. II.], and the English Baronial Charters [*t.* Hen. II. reflecting Hen. I.]. Exactly what pacts (if definitely expressed) were made with the Conqueror's Barons can be but a matter of speculation,—but there is no particular improbability in supposing that a tax on the fee then existed, and that the "Knights" *in exercitu* were supported by the contributions of their compeers, and others, who did not militate. That the vague service *in exercitu* due to the Crown was on a more ample scale *t.* Wm. I. to Hen. II. than Hen. II. to Ed. II. is highly probable (tho' no particular information is available till Hen. I.), but it should be borne in mind that the majority of lay tenants of 1166 (or by their ancestors), had been feft *post* Wm. I.—owing to the forfeitures of the earlier barons.

Diversity  
of Services  
due.

Thus the fief of Moreton\* escheated at the com-

\* This fief would have been "good cheap" at a *service* of 500, according to the measure of the A.D. 1166-8 entries, and the above *very incomplete* analysis shows *c.* 350 fees, hence 350

Partial  
analysis of  
Moreton  
Escheat.

mencement of the reign of Hen. I., and from it arose *very numerous* capital tenants, to all appearance, *ut de corona*; thus, Earl Reginald in Cornwall (*c.* 215 $\frac{1}{3}$  fees), succeeding Wm. *f.* Richard, whose father may have been the Earl's undertenant in *D. B.*; Ric. de Aquila. (35); Galf. Martell (7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ); Bern. Pullein (1); Wm. *f.* John de Harper-tree; Wm. *f.* John; Ric. *f.* Wm.; Nich. *f.* Harding; Ric. del Estre; Walt. Brito (15); Ro.

Evidence  
of the  
*Roman de Rou.*

or 500 or more *milites* led by the Earl of Moreton to the musters of Wm. I.—the nos. almost alike improbable. It may be observed that the *services* (to scutage), *t.* Hen. II., were approximately in total on an equality with the infeudations—the current theory therefore involves all the “Knights” (say 6,000-7,000) being present *in exercitu*: yet the *Roman de Rou* (lines 11,253-9, and *Feudal England*, p. 260), makes Wm. *f.* Osbern (certainly not with the approbation of his compeers), offer to *double* the *chevaliers* for the expedition to England (1066),—that the barons could easily have so done is not improbable, as *by* the Norman Inq., *t.* Hen. II., the figures of which by no means reach *Wace's* [he names 20, 30, and 100 *chevaliers* to become 40, 60, and 200]. The *Roman de Rou* [lines 11,364—5] cites Duke Wm. as setting his baronage an excellent example of evading feudal obligations to his lord,

*Petit sert mais meins servira*  
*Quant plus ara meins vos fera*

to be compared with the *tam parvam fortitudinem hominum secum adducet quam minorem poterit ita tamen ne inde feodum suum erga Regem Franciæ forisfaciat* of the Dukes of Flanders in the already cited conventions of 1101, 1103, and 1163, and the ten (1103), and twenty (1163) *milites* to the assistance of the French Kings as *service*, whilst to the English ones, 1,000 and 500 “Knights” can be furnished (for cash down). What is recorded of the Conqueror's *lay* Baronage either in England or Normandy very little suggests they would rigidly conform to any *fixed* and *definite* military obligations *in exercitu*,—the diminution of the army service of Bp. Bayeux from 40 (*t.* Hen. I.), to 20 (*t.* Hen. II.), has already been remarked.

Beauchamp (17); Hen. Lupel (18); Wm. Fossard ( $31\frac{1}{2}$ ), presumably the successor of Nigel Fossard,\* Earl Moreton's Yorkshire undertenant; and many others, including the Honor of Berkhamstead retained in the hands of the Crown ( $22\frac{3}{5}$  fees),—it seems clear enough that all these *servitia debita* are of *t.* Hen. I., and have no very direct connection with the number of *milites* Earl Robert led to the Conqueror's musters, tho' perhaps in some relation to the "Knights" that had been enfeoffed, and the pecuniary assistance they could render.

The charters of Earl Hugh and Wm. de Albenia (*Pincerna*) are good evidence to demonstrate early lay systematic enfeoffments on an ample scale, by the unit of Knight Service; for Roger Bigot departed this life in 1107 (*Vitalis*), or 1108 (*Hoveden*),†

Early subinfeudations of lay tenants.

\* The Fossard fief in the Baronial Charters (1166) is entered under Suffolk, but is essentially a Yorkshire one, and so answered in the Pipe Rolls: a few of the tenants named were capital tenants (apart from the fees of Moreton), thus Nich. *f.* Harding, whose fief of Meriet had been held since the acquet of England [*T. de N.*; also in D. B.], but very few of any minor capital tenants of 1166 can be traced to D. B.: of these Rog. de Berkeley is one, but part of his holding had been at fee farm, part under his reeveship, and but a minority by possible Knight Service. The fief of Belet [1210-1212; vol. ii. *L. R.* p. 545] is clearly that of D. B. [i. 84a], and is rated as 1 fee in 1166 [*debet servitium j militis*], but the Wm. Belot of 1086 [*ut sup.*], is returned amongst the *servientes regis*—I do not suppose that one in 100 of the numerous thanes and *servientes* of the King (1086) could be traced as capital Crown tenants 1166, by knt. service.

Fees held since the Acquest of England.

† *Vide* also Florence of Worcester, from whose Chronicle it descends to Rog. de *Hoveden*.

Duke  
Richard's  
military  
service.

before which he had feft to the extent of 115 fees [*vide* his son's charter 1166]—likewise before the death of said Roger, his son in law (the said Wm.), had of the gift of Hen. I., 15 and 10 fees *already* subinfeuded [*vide* his son's charter 1166]; in addition *Florence* of Worcester (1086) uses the expresssion, *quot feudatos milites*, referring to *D. B.*, and tho' that valuable record is no Feodary, it gives the information the chronicler records, tho' not in so ample a manner, as would occur in a specific return of Knight Service.

Subin-  
feudation,  
*t. Wm. I.*

The Exon. *D. B.*; the *I. C. C.*, and *I. E.* (ed. Hamilton), in conjunction with *D. B.* set early feudal tenure in a clearer aspect: in the latter [*I. E.*, presumably *t. Wm. I.*, and almost certainly 11th cent.], amongst the list of ploughs (p. 168, ed. Hamilton, and in all 3 of his originals), occurs the following [hitherto unnoticed, *ut credo*], with reference to the vill of Teusham,\*—*Hoc tenet iohannes in feudo de abbate pro duobus militibus*. Another reference to military service occurs in *Will. Gemet.*, of the early 11th century [*accipiens munere comitatum ut inde exhiberet ei militiæ statuta*, compare, *in statuto servitio Milicie* in the Charter of Hen. I., *Lib. El. III.*], which (former) is cited more fully in *The Scutage and Knight Service of England*.†

Duke  
Richard's  
Military  
Service.

\* *Vide D. B.*, i. 191a and 201b, where the lordship of the vill is divided between the Abbot of Ely and John f. Waleran, perhaps the same tenant as in *I. E.*, *ut sup.*

† The reference to *Wm. de Jumièges* was made known to writer by this work (J. F. Baldwin, *Univ. Chicago Press*, 1897), which is well deserving the attention of all—interested in the



Feudal System—either in America or England: there are (and it can scarcely be otherwise with a vol. written so far from original sources) many demonstrable errors, and also a rather too conspicuous tendency to combine the opinions of English writers (named). But the subject has been well laboured from printed works, and the author, having a clear conception of his own views, is intelligible enough to the reader: a certain well known *historical* method, is to attempt to consign to oblivion, all *intrusive* works, at the same time quietly making use of their references (occasion arising), as suitable *novelties*. There is another citation of *servitium militum* (*t. Wm. I., p. ix., ut sup.*), and should his occasions permit, it is to be hoped, this writer will continue his investigations in English History, for readers both of his own, and this country.

A recent American work on the Feudal System.

It is not, of course, to be inferred that the mere fact of residence on a Western continent confers a particular immunity on historical writers, for I would not suppose that, even the most ingenious of our own artificers of History could hope to surpass, and scarcely to equal, *Ancient Britain in the light of modern Archæological Discoveries*. This *magnum opus* states that “albeit the true character of the false Saxon chronicles have (*sic*) been frequently exposed, they still continue to colour our popular histories, and to injuriously affect our national policy” (p. ix); that its design is “to restore to the pages of British history those circumstances of which forgery and imposture have deprived it, and which archæology has found safely preserved in the pure bosom of the earth” (p. x); that the *A. S.* chronicles are “patched forgeries of the eleventh or twelfth centuries, probably done in Rome, and wholly unworthy of credit” (p. 74); that “ancient trash piled . . . accepted by the modern world as the groundwork for a history of Britain and the construction of its national policy” (p. 74); that “so far as books go, the Sacred College of Rome had the entire making of European history . . . until the invention of printing put an end to its monopoly” (p. 180); that Beda’s information concerning the Anglo-Saxons “was hopelessly wrong and defective” (p. 73), and terminates by bringing “to book” “the theory” of Beda (p. 181).

A *magnum opus* on *Ancient Britain*.

Extracts from, and design of said work.

Now be it observed that a certain grandeur, and magnificence of language (well enough adapted to exploit the discoveries of Professors of the Arts of Graphology, Phrenology, Palmistry, etc.), is in itself no proof *absolute* of their author's lack of more real attainments; such is apt, in the mind of certain readers, to raise a curiosity as to the fulfilment of expectations suggested by a platform of premises so great. Now it is at once allowed that even from the most pretentious, and least solid of books, some useful information may issue, but whatever success "circumstances" "safely preserved in the pure bosom of the earth," might or might not have in refuting "the false Saxon chronicles," such are (in *Ancient Britain, etc.*) neither exposed, nor digested in a manner calculated to afford (at least to the *tenuiter edocti*) any proof of their existence (as on p. x); that is, the author does not favour his readers with that special access to their\* repository which himself must be presumed to have.

The ancestors of the English brought with them "the polytheism of the Mongolian steppes" (p. 53), and the Romans found in Britain, "the Buddhic polytheism of the Goths" (p. 54), whose "bitter hatred of hierarchical government" was not "an Aryan sentiment, nor a Teutonic, nor a German one," but "purely and distinctly Gothic" (p. 190), so that the hitherto illiterate reader, now rather persuaded of the error of believing his predecessors were of the *Indo-European* race (as he might have imagined), is amply compensated by the possible reward of Chinese *originals*: as the Gothic sentiment (*ut. sup.*) is anti-Teutonic, he will naturally be distressed to understand why he, or any other Scandinavian or English descendant of the Goths, should now be speaking a language essentially Germanic—here the author might well come to his aid in revealing one of those secrets of the "pure bosom, etc." (p. x) to which he alone has so easy an access.

Formation  
of A. S.  
Chronicles.

The *A. S.* chronicles doubtless took their present form *t. Alfred* (9th cent.), and are in hands of the 9th to the 12th cent. (the last terminates in 1154, but most of the writing would seem to antedate 1066, the French form of letters of

\* *Sc.* the interred, and now disinterred, "circumstances," a notional meaning, and exact particulars, of which are so difficult to attain.

the 11th cent. being notably different from those of Saxon England), being compiled from Beda, and presumably embodying divers local memoranda: the existence of such for *Northumbria*, 732-801, can easily be demonstrated by drawing out the provincial entries from the *Northern Annals* (praised for Symeon of *Durham*), and by comparison with the *National Chronicle*, the consistent and more complete notices in the former (or rather its *original*, or *originals*), evidently having furnished the more slender items in the latter. It is not easy to see why the "Sacred College" (p. 180) should have wrought essentially heathen pedigrees for the *A. S.* kings in the *Chronicle*; it is still less easy to understand why the statements of contemporary historians are *usually*\* confirmed by records, nor how the works of Matth. Paris and divers others containing matter extremely hostile to Pontifical authority could escape the censorship of said College—it, it may be repeated, is difficult, but not impossible of explanation to one having a source of authority—"the pure bosom, etc." (p. x)—unhappily denied to ordinary mankind.

The *Annals of Northumbria.*

*Chroni-  
clers.*

As to English events in Britain prior to the time of Beda, it may be remarked that learning reached the North from Ireland *c.* 565, a few years after the reputed landing of the 1st King of *Northumbria*, prior to which, let it be supposed, *Runic* letters would not be unknown in England: a chronology of the authentic *Kings* of his province, is appended to a copy of Bede (the writing praised for the 8th cent.), and traditional predecessors of the royal houses might well be handed down in the verse of *Scalds* (even, if not in writing), their authenticity of course not being alleged.

Introduc-  
tion of  
Learning  
in the  
North.

Royal  
Gene-  
alogies.

In the vol. under note the *Suevi* appear as a *Slavic* tribe (p. 138), a Gothic or semi-Gothic one (p. 193), where also, as of the "Sacæ or Goths of the Euxine and Baltic, the *Gotbones* of Tacitus," so that it would appear that Goths and Sclavs were all one; without, however, attempting to determine whether the author's authority on the ethnology of the *Suevi* derives from *inspiration*, or *exhumation*, it may be stated that Gothic and Germanic are often used (*not* in *Ancient Britain*, etc.) as terms interchangeable, but perhaps the most convenient *modus* is to include Scandinavians, Angles, Saxons and *Deutschen* under the term *Germani* (the *Germania* of Tacitus is of course not the present German Empire, and

Gothic and  
Germanic.

\* No particular accuracy for dates, nor correctness in matters statistical, is here suggested.

*Beda* counts as *Germani* Angles, Saxons, Frisians, Danes, etc.), and to consider the Anglo-Saxons akin more particularly to the Norse [leaving open the question of whether or not *Angulus* was part of 5th century Scandinavia\*], rather than to the inhabitants of the Empire to which *Charlemagne* succeeded. To class Norse, Angles and Saxons as *Goths* of *Mongolia*, and the *Deutschen* as Germans and presumably (p. 190) *Aryans*, has certainly the advantage of novelty, and needs but some trifling explanation [as that *Confucius* had, with considerable foresight, instructed the Gothic races (prior to their emigrations), in the speech of Germany], to become impregnable; doubtless, by an oversight (not altogether irremediable) the learned author has omitted to supply from his often named, and particular repository, this necessary explanation (for a dull reader), as to language.

Goths,  
*Gutæ*,  
*Gothones*,  
and  
*Gothini*.

*Dani*,  
*Suethans*,  
and  
*Suethidi*,  
not neces-  
sarily  
Gothic.

*Angli* and  
*Suevi*;  
their loca-  
tion.

*Regnar*  
*Lodbrog* in  
English  
History,  
A.D. 870;  
his speech  
under-  
stood.

Deficiency  
of the  
Collection  
of the *Mon.*  
*Hist. Brit.*,  
as to early  
evidences  
of the  
English  
races.

\* How to apply and limit the term Scandinavia, 5th cent., is beyond the power of the writer to discern, but it may be observed that the earlier writers make no mention of *Goths* in it, unless indeed the *Gutæ* (see p. 109j, and for further illustration) of *Ptolemy* are held to be such: at the same time that author (whose *Geography*, praised for A.D. 120, seems sometimes to antedate *Tacitus*) locates the *Guthones* (within the *Venedi*) in *Sarmatia*,—apparently the *Gothones* of the *Germania*, who live more under the constraint of monarchy than the other Germanic *gentes*. The *Gothini* of *Tacitus*, who pay tribute, and work the iron mines, were not far from the Danube; now certain it is that *Jornandes* (c. 552) derives the notable *Goths* (who overran much of S. Europe from the 3rd to the 5th century) of the Danube, from *Scanzia*, in which he locates the *Suethans*, *Suethidi*, and *Dani* (who also originate in it), whereas the classifications of its inhabitants by later writers, render it particularly doubtful that any *Goths* had more than mere settlement in certain parts of *Scandinavia*. Both King *Alfred* and *Beda* consider the *Danes* as Germanic, and derive the *Angli* from the *Schleswic* district, whereas *Ptolemy* and *Tacitus* agree in esteeming the latter, as of the *Suevi* (cf. p. 109j) a *gens* noted by Cæsar, and occupying about the Elbe, *t. Strabo* (c. A.D. 30), and at the time (c. A.D. 100), of the two above-named writers, the former of whom (*Ptolemy*), does not locate the *Angli* on the actual coast (the *Saxones*, for one, on the neck of the *Cymbric Chersonese* cut them off), as does the latter (or near it,—the island, etc., *Germania*, 40): besides the evidence for esteeming the Scandinavians to be also, to a great extent of the *Suevi* (see p. 109j), the St. Alban's Chronicler (praised for Rog. Wendover, and Matth. Paris), using some unknown *Passio* of St. Edmund, names the likeness of the Danish to the Anglian speech, in the converse of *Regnar Lodbrog*, with the King and Martyr (*in anno* 870). The *Mon. Hist. Brit.* (a work laborious enough) concerns itself, at some length, with notices of the early inhabitants of Britain, but although produced at the common charge of the English is singularly deficient as to their *originals*, a line of investigation which might have been esteemed just as pertinent, as a collection relating to Roman subjects; this (some illustration of the *Germanic* races who settled in England as *Angles*, *Danes*, *Norse*, and *Saxons*), the present writer hopes to essay (occasion permitting) as an introduction to *A History of Northumbria*.

## A NOTE ON THE AGRICULTURE IN TACITUS' ACCOUNT OF *GERMANIA*.

*Tacitus'* (born *c.* A.D. 40 to 56) wrote his account of *Ger-* *Tacitus'*  
*Germania.*  
*mania*, *c.* A.D. 98; dismissing the question as to the exact value of this author's information, and gathering *data* from the whole of his short work, it may be observed that although some of the *gentes* noticed are under more or less despotic rule (25, 43-5),\* many exist as communities enjoying and appreciating a considerable degree of liberty (11, 37, *cf.* 45), under *reges* (7, 11, 43-4), or *principes* (11, 15, 22). The Germanic† tribes appear to have dwelt in villages (*vici*, 16), their ranks being composed of *nobiles* (7, 25, 44), *ingenui* (20, 25, 38, 44), *liberti* (25, 44), and *servi* [24, 25, 32 (*familia*), 38, 44, 45]: a difference between the warriors and actual cultivators of the soil is apparent (14, 15, and *perhaps* 26), the *principes* [who maintain a retinue (*comites*, 13, 14), averse to the labour of husbandry (14)], receiving a voluntary tribute of cattle and grains (*armenta* and *fruges* 15), suppose for consumption. The distinction is by no means so clearly marked as to enable the statement that *warriors* and *cultivators* are terms inconvertible; but the bravest of the former class are depicted as leaving the care of the fields (*agri*, 15, *cf.* 26) to the women, aged, and infirm of their households; these (latter) are presumably *ingenui* rather than *servi*.‡ The *plebes* (11) include the *ingenui*, and perhaps the *liberti*; the *reges* and *principes* appear to be of the *nobiles* (7, 11, 13); and the *duces* (7) not necessarily above the rank of the *ingenui*: no

---

\* The bracketed nos. refer to the divisions of *Tacitus'* text.

† *Tacitus* does not consider all the tribes he names as Germanic; of those he names as such, no comment as to origin is here made.

‡ At any rate in section 15.

permanent property in land exists (26), but in its products (26), and in *servi*, household goods, farm stock, armour and horses (5, 12, 18, 32). That the latter (12, 18, 32) were used in Husbandry is not made apparent; oxen (*boves*, 18); herds (*armenta*, 5, 15, 21); flocks\* (*pecora*, 12, 21, 25), and of course cows† [tho' indirectly (23)] are named: the food of the *gentes* includes fresh meat (23), cheese or an approach to it (23), and grain stuffs (15, 16),—the common drink is beer or its *antecessor* (23), and those tribes nearest the Rhine buy *vinum* (23). Of crops, *Tacitus* distinctly mentions wheat (*frumentum*, 23, 25, 45), barley (*hordeum*, 23), and, I think, uninclosed meadow (*pratium*, 26), noting an appreciation of the winter, spring, and summer seasons (26): as horses are used in warfare, cattle for consumption, oxen for the plough (*iuncti boves*, 18), cows for breeding and milk (23), the Roman writer scarcely needed to inform the readers of his day that *oats* and *hay* were known to the *Germani*, perhaps also *rye*. In the commentary on *Tacitus*, in the excellent *Const. Hist.* (i. 18), wheat is cited as the only corn crop, a statement having of intrinsic probability little enough; reference to sections 2 (*asperam cœlo*); 5 (*satis ferax*); 15 (*frugum*); 16 (*receptaculum frugibus*); 23 (*ex hordeo aut frumento*); 26 (*seges*); 26 (*hiems et ver*); and 45 (*frumenta ceterosque fructus*) will demonstrate it to be opposed to the witness of the Roman writer, whose work should always be used to test the interpretations of his exponents. The *servi* are portrayed rather as *coloni* (25) than domestics, paying their lords a tribute in wheat, live stock, or raiment, their position being somewhat akin to that of our *villani* (12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> cent.), though the lord of a Manor would not usually have been able to kill, or strike his *villein* with impunity (25): the land occupied by the *servus* would presumably be regarded as the property (for the time) of the *dominus*,—as a kind of rent is paid therefrom, the slave in a certain sense worked for his lord, even supposing he never cultivated the fields more particularly

\* *Pecora*, not necessarily flocks, but (21) *armentorum ac pecorum* seems to require some meaning other than herds.

† *Lac concretum*; even, if not the produce of cows, *boves* and *armenta* compel their existence.

set apart for the household of the *dominus*. There are no mediæval Manors, no theories of the *mark*, nor of the 120 acre system; there is nothing (*ut uidetur mihi*) to be adduced in demonstration of 2 or 3 course shifts, nor (*ut credo*) is there any decided negative of rotations; there is ample testimony (4, 14, 15-17, 22, 26, 45) of a general aversion to labour, wastefulness of Agriculture, and abundance of land (*agri*). Section 26 particularly relates to Husbandry; in it I understand *Tacitus* to remark that the arable, meadow, and grass fields of the Germans are occupied (or put to profit) by all, in their respective villages to an extent regulated by the number of actual cultivators (*agri pro numero cultorum ab universis in vicis occupantur*), supposing that *all* signifies each free household, and that a husbandman, free or the contrary, is indicated by *cultor*, rather than an inhabitant, and that should *in vices* be the true reading,\* the sense turns on alternate periods of labour for individuals: the conclusion of the sentence (*quos mox inter se secundum dignationem partiuntur*)—which fields they (the heads of each free household) soon (suppose in April or May) divide amongst themselves according to their dignity (*sc.* a lord with many *servi* would naturally need a share much more ample than an *ingenuus* with a few, or a *libertus* with none). *Facilitatem partiendi camporum spatia præstant* follows, indicating that the abundance of land renders partition easy, there being therefore ample sustenance for each individual: this is succeeded by the lines *Arva per annos mutant et superest ager*, which (*ut videtur mihi*) implies that the Germans change their arable lands (or some of them) yearly (by ploughing land out of grass), and (nevertheless) land in grass is left in plenty (owing to the already mentioned abundance): the section closes with further notice of the supineness of the husbandmen, and the amplitude of the soil (*amplitudine soli*), and a remark that the arable is only taxed with grain crops (*sola terræ seges imperatur*), indicating that beans, peas, *etc.*, were not cultivated. The entire Chapter comprises less than twelve lines, including a thrice-repeated statement as to excess of land beyond the immediate requirements of the population: in spite of this particular assistance from *Tacitus*, the Roman writer has of

---

\* Cf. *Cæsar* (c. B.C. 50), in his a/c of the *Suevi*: a possible reading would be—frequent changes of pasture, by reason of its superfluity.

late been credited with statements, whose inconsistencies could scarcely have failed to impress the well informed readers of his own day. In one version the word *mutant* is supposed to refer to a rotation, and *ager* is rendered *fallow*\* (I know not on what authority); it is clear therefore *arva* is either equivalent to all the ploughed land, or such of it as is sown, so that *Tacitus* is constrained to say that (*a*) the entire arable is in rotation, and (*b*) a fallow is left, the (*b*) statement being contained in (*a*), as the mere fact of a *shift* denotes a *fallow*, or else that the land under crop (or some of it) is changed to a *fallow*, and a *fallow* is left, which reading is alike elegant and cogent with the other.† In another *lectio* (A. J. Church, M.A., Latin text, 1898, notes) the word *mutant* is attributed to a change of occupancy; but certain it is that the mere usure of a piece of ploughed land by either *princeps*, *dux*, or *ingenuus* in turns has nothing whatever to do with the relative abundance of the fields other than arable (here *agri*), the above version leaving the rest of the sentence connected by *et* in suspense "betwixt earth, air, and seas," and void of meaning, whereas the ploughing of *ley* land reduces the *ager*, for the simple reason that land left from the plough would not be particularly profitable *ager* for some time to come; further, the alternate occupation of arable presupposes a rotation, and how mere difference of owners year after year on the *arva* could affect the *ager* is a mystery that no one (*tenuiter edoctus*) can hope to explain. It has been stated (*supra*) that *Tacitus* does not absolutely negative rotations, but if *arva per annos mutant* requires the rendering that *all* the arable is changed *p.a.*, the ploughed

\* If it is held that the change implies rotations which include *fallow*, and hence a diminution of the grass land (*ager*), this would mark a contrast between a nation using no, or not so much bare *fallow*, and one accustomed to some, or more of it, and hence relative extravagance of Husbandry: at the same time the latter would *not* change their arable (as with 2 fields in a 2 course shift *both* would be *arva*), but merely its cultivation; further the *literal* rendering of the words *arva per annos mutant* (an actual change of fields), is full of meaning, whereas ideas *read in*, to support theories (*e.g.*, they change their fields amongst themselves, or change the crops in their fields, or change their arable from crop to fallow) are rebutted as well by the context, as the inconsistencies they involve.

† *Arva* seems to denote the entire arable (whatever was "ered"), rather than *only* that portion sown; and a possible, but improbable, reading might be formed by limiting *arva* to seeded arable, and by supposing the Romans made little use of bare *fallows*—rendering *ager* as land not under the plough.



*fallow* of a 2 or 3 course *shift* is of course impossible ; the Roman writer perhaps did not intend a remark so entirely definite, tho' it must be allowed he pourtrays the husbandmen as very little patient of labor, further than the necessities of the times render expedient. The absence of landownership is well explained in *Tacitus*, and it seems perspicuous enough that a division of the earth's products could be more suitably arranged towards hay time and harvest : it does not seem to follow that the partition, when made, was necessarily in proportion to the number of the actual tillers of the soil in autumn and winter from each free household, as the warlike occasions of the *gentes* would disturb such an arrangement, and the *princeps* and his *comites* (who seem to foreshadow the *feudal system*) might be generally allotted a return out of proportion to the contributions to the labor of husbandry made from their households, in addition to the voluntary tribute already cited. To bring into the sketch the mediæval system of agriculture as to rotations and ownership, the text of *Tacitus* scarcely permits ; any sort of settled property in the *arable* nullifies the word *mox*, as the writer would scarcely expect the critics of his day to believe in divisions of property whose descent, tho' not successive, was *already* defined by alternation. These tribes include the *Angli* (40), who *may* have been the ancestors of the race of the same name, who afterwards settled in England ; those of *Tacitus* belonged to the *Suevi*, and appear to have been one of the freer communities : English and Scandinavian traditions unite in representing the later *Angli* as deriving from what in *historic* times was Denmark, rather than Germany, but both countries are of course included in *Germania* (1<sup>st</sup> cent.). The exact ancestors of the modern Scandinavians\*

*Angli* and  
*Suevi*.

\* *Pomponius Mela* (c. 45) names the island [always so till the 6th Early century, at least, and of unknown magnitude] of *Scandinavia*, as yet notices of held by the *Teutoni* : *Pliny*, the naturalist (c. 79), says part of it, containing 500 *pagi*, was held by the *Hillevioni*, noting also the islands of *Scandia*, *Dumna*, *Bergos* and *Nerigo*, from which (latter) the voyage to *Thule* is wont to be made : *Solinus Polyhistor* (c. 80) mentions *Scandinavia*, as the largest of the islands of *Germania* : *Tacitus* (c. 98) places the *Suiones* [this term recurs in *Eginhard* (c. 820) as applicable to Swedes and Norwegians, and in *Adam of Bremen* (c. 1077), who

Scandi-  
navian  
English.

(*t. Tacitus*) I have never seen satisfactorily determined ; but certain it is that a very considerable proportion of the inhabitants of England (*t. 1086*) were of Norse (chiefly Danish) origin, as is witnessed by *D. B.*, the old records of *Northumbria* (which should be read with the *A.S. Chron.*), and other notices of the *Danelaga*, in addition to such evidences as nomenclature ; and tho' the Normans were a compound race, speaking a foreign language, it is scarcely to be supposed it was other than the *Northman* element which enabled them to acquire England at that period.

The *Angli*  
and  
*Suiones* of  
*Suevia* ;  
*Dani*,  
Dacians,  
and *Gute*.

seems to confine it to the former] with a fleet, certainly in the mainland of Sweden, and probably in some of the Danish isles ; beyond the *Suiones* are the *Sitones* (presumably a Finnish tribe, N. of Upsala, and near the ancient city of *Sictona*), and here *Suevia* ends [this writer, be it observed, classes both *Angli* and *Suiones* as *Suevi*, and calls the Baltic, the *Suevian* Sea] ; *Ptolemy* (120 or before) places the *Dauciones* and *Gute* in the island of *Scandia* [whether Danes and Jutes, or not, the *Dani* are frequently termed Dacians, thus, *Gerald de Barri*, 12th cent., notes the corruption of the Northern speech by the frequent invasions of Dacians, and Norwegians, and *Wm. f. Alan*, 1166, owes one knt. in Norfolk at *Carlefi*, against the Dacians, there being no immediate connexion with a nation on the Danube in either case] : *Jornandes* (6th cent.) locates the *Suethans* and *Dani* in *Scanzia* (*quasi officina gentium*) island : *Procopius* (6th cent.), seems to place the Danes about Denmark, near the *Varni* (extending to the N. Ocean, and separated from the Franks by the Rhine) ; calls *Scandinavia*, the island of *Thule*, which he has only visited by the converse of those coming therefrom—this is that author who mentions *Brittia*, as inhabited by Angles, Frisians and Britons, an expedition by sea of the former, led by their king's sister against the *Varni* (*supra*) ; and as well notices of British legations, lack of cavalry and horsemanship, navy, marriage (*cf. Tacitus*), as various poetical legends : *Beda* (c. 730) gives the Danes as one of the nations from whom Angles and Saxons derive ; and *Wm. Malmesburien*. (*t. 1135*) makes a traditional ancestor of the A. S. kings, first a foundling in the *Scanzia* of *Jornandes*, and afterwards a ruler in *Slaswic* (*Haithaby*), which may be a compilation from *Ethelward* (writing 975-1011), who states that *Old Anglia* was situated between the Saxons and Jutes (*Gioti*), with a capital town *Slesuic* (*Saxonicæ*), or *Haithaby* (*Danice*), that Hengist's ancestor was *Uuothen*, whom the Danes, *Northmanni* and *Suevi*, worship to this day, citing *Lucan* (1st cent.) as to the latter, *fundit ab extremo flavos aquiione Suevos*, which corroborates *Tacitus* ; and in another passage makes *Scef* (the son of *Scyld*), *Cerdic*'s 19th ancestor, land on the island of *Scani* and become king, whereas in the *Beowulf*, *Scyld Scéfing*, is the found'ing, and then king of the *gár-Denum* (spear-bearing Danes).

*Brittia* and  
the *Varni*  
in the 6th  
cent.

Traditional  
kinship of  
Angles,  
Danes,  
Jutes,  
Northmen,  
Saxons,  
and *Suevi*.

## CHAPTER III

### AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

“This is an Age wherein to commend or extol an Ingenious Art or Science might be deemed a Needless Labour, especially in a Country so highly improved in everything ; but that we find the more Noble, Advantagious, Useful, or Necessary, any Art, Science, or Profession is, the stronger Arguments are framed against it ; and more particularly against the Rustick Art and its infinite Preheminances and Oblectations, by the vainer and more pedant sort of persons, despising the worth or value of what they are ignorant of, who judge it below their honour or reputation to take any notice of so mean a profession ; that esteem the Country no other than a place for Beasts as Cities for Men.”—Worlidge’s *Proemium to Systema Agriculturæ*, ed. 1681.

THE fiscal Hide of Domesday contained (or <sup>120 Fiscal Acres.</sup> often did) 120 fiscal acres, and the normal areal Hide 120 actual ones, which perhaps accounts for the statement that a like quantity was tilled by each plough *per ann.*—which is opposed to the common experience and knowledge of any English farmer of arable, and would predicate weather suitable for constant aration ; whereas 30 weeks in the year is perhaps a high estimate of the period during which land can be worked, and 40-60 acres may be roughly taken as the present land of one plough. The work on Husbandry derived from the MS. of Sir Walter de Henley (and printed by the R.H.S.) presumes a 3 or

2 course shift, of which respectively  $\frac{1}{3}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$  in bare fallow ; for the former take 180 ac., for the latter crops 160 ac. (in each case *statute*), plough once for and twice for fallow ;† allow 8 weeks for holy days (presumably including the 3-4 weeks noted in *Custumals* at the Nativity, Easter, and Pentecost, and the time occupied by the ploughmen on their own holdings, etc.), leaving 44 weeks for unbroken aration, thus

Scheme of Perpetual Aration.	THREE COURSE SHIFT.						Days
	180 acres (120 ac. in crop, 60 ac. in fallow) at $\frac{7}{8}$ ac.						
	per day	...	...	...	...	...	205 $\frac{5}{7}$
	*60 acres (2nd fallowing) at 1 ac. per day	...	...	...	...	...	60
							265 $\frac{5}{7}$
					Add for Sundays		44 $\frac{2}{7}$
					Total		310

TWO COURSE SHIFT.						Days
160 acres (80 in crop, 80 in fallow) at $\frac{7}{8}$ ac. per day						182 $\frac{6}{7}$
80 acres (2nd fallowing) at 1 ac. per day	...	...	...	...	...	80
						262 $\frac{6}{7}$

With Sundays, *Total c. ut sup.*

in either case, the total working out as above, viz., nearly exactly 44 weeks.

The above has been construed to mean that for a continuous period of 44 weeks the ploughmen

Welsh  
evidence,  
*t. Hen. II.*

† *Gerald de Barri* (*t. Hen. II.*) remarks the neglect of husbandry of the Welsh, stating they *only* plough *once each* for wheat and oats in winter and spring, and *twice* in summer—the husbandman leaving his oxen on occasion of war, whereas the theoretical ploughmen (*ut sup.*) are depicted as having little existence other than as members of their teams.

\* In Canon Taylor's learned paper on "The Ploughland and the Plough," the accomplished writer seems to imagine that (in a 3 Course Shift) either fallow land was unploughed, or that each team ploughed 240 acres.

not only *could*, but also *did*, plough all day and every day (saving the 7th), no matter the weather, storms, snow, frost, floods, hay time, harvest, etc.; now if the author means to make this assertion he must be postulating that he conceived his day and generation equally as credulous, as some of the writers on agriculture in the 19th century. The 60,000 knights and fees of King William (apparently still in repute, see "Social England") and the 45,000 parish churches supposed to exist in 1371, are errors one can understand, but why such exceeding mystery as to an art daily in operation before our eyes, should appear in the productions of scholars who honor (?) Agriculture with their notice, is not easily conceivable.

Returning to Walter de Henley it may be suggested that he intended to convey that if the above evidently unreal programme took place, then would the amount tilled by each plough in the year be such a quantity of land, as is termed a carucate: in addition the author is supposed to have flourished in the first  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the 13th century, and is describing cultivation of demesne land, which it must have been known, was to a considerable extent tilled by the tenantry—this he says nothing about.

Before proceeding to discuss ancient evidences, a contrast of the agriculture of 1086, 1696, and 1897 may not be out of place; the crops of 1086 were \*Wheat, Barley, Oats, Rye, Beans, Peas, and perhaps Vetches; of 1696 in ordinary rotation, the same including Vetches; for 1897 add such

Agriculture  
1086, 1696,  
and 1897  
contrasted.

---

\* D. B. Wheat 11a, 32a, 176b, Oats 214a, Rye 257b.

## ENGLAND AND WALES (KING) 1696.

	1696, Acres.	1897, Acres.
Arable at 5s. 10d. per acre ...	10,000,000	12,505,049
Flax, Woad, etc., at 5s. 10d. per acre ... ..	1,000,000	
Pasture and meadow at 9s. per acre ... ..	10,000,000	15,122,121
Woods, coppices at 5s. per acre ... ..	3,000,000	1,847,351
Forests, parks, commons at 3s. 6d. per acre ... ..	3,000,000	
Heaths, moors, etc., at 1s. per acre ... ..	10,000,000	3,363,281
Houses, gardens, orchards, etc.	1,000,000	4,480,181
Rivers, lakes, meres at 2s. per acre ... ..	500,000	
Roads, ways, waste land ...	500,000	
Average value, 6s. 2d. per acre	<u>39,000,000</u>	<u>37,317,983</u>

ENGLAND AND WALES, 1897 (excluding tidal  
water and foreshore).

	England in acres.	Wales in acres.
Arable ... ..	11,602,191	902,858
Pasture ... ..	13,191,789	1,930,332
Mountain, heath, etc. ...	2,208,844	1,154,437
Orchards ... ..	218,261	3,707
Woods and plantations ...	1,665,741	181,610
In inland waters, <i>say</i> ...	180,000	600,955
Towns, houses, waste grounds, <i>say</i> ... ..	3,477,258	
	<u>32,544,084</u>	<u>4,773,899</u>

TEAMLANDS AND CROPS (21 COUNTIES),  
A.D. 1086-1897.

Counties.	1086, Team- lands.	1086, 120 Acre Theory ; Arable Acres.	1897, Grain Crops, Acres.	1897, Vetches, Acres.	1897, Fallow, Acres.	1897, Total of Crops grown 1086, Acres.	1897, Total Arable, Acres.
Devon ...	7,972	956,640	243,165	3,581	7,675	245,421	588,639
Lincs ...	5,043	605,160	560,195	9,014	25,692	594,901	1,018,886
Somerset ...	4,858	582,960	98,692	3,960	3,348	106,000	209,618
Wilts ...	3,457	414,840	149,449	16,591	7,676	173,716	318,719
Northants ...	2,931	351,720	127,234	3,918	10,502	141,654	213,605
Hants ...	2,847	341,640	192,286	17,159	15,898	225,343	443,759
Oxon ...	2,639	316,680	124,096	6,836	5,477	136,409	224,424
Cornwall ...	2,377	285,240	124,504	518	5,105	130,127	366,178
Dorset ...	2,303	276,360	83,184	5,260	3,671	92,115	187,108
Warwick ...	2,276	273,120	93,927	2,263	6,587	102,777	168,511
Bucks ...	2,244	269,280	94,439	4,371	8,564	107,374	165,001
Berks ...	2,087	250,440	106,049	6,946	9,403	122,398	202,558
Herts ...	1,716	205,920	124,894	3,937	14,007	142,838	218,115
Cambs ...	1,676	201,020	221,693	4,687	15,341	241,721	372,765
Beds ...	1,557	186,840	89,425	3,255	11,700	104,380	152,574
Staffs ...	1,398	167,760	84,088	1,841	1,765	87,694	173,744
Notts ...	1,255	150,600	121,300	2,492	9,780	133,572	241,092
Surrey ...	1,172	140,640	57,681	3,521	8,546	59,748	131,041
Hunts ...	1,120	134,400	73,863	2,225	9,275	85,363	123,531
Derby ...	762	91,440	47,974	1,303	2,570	51,847	97,602
Middlesex ...	664	79,680	10,606	1,245	1,374	13,225	32,955
Total ...	52,354	6,282,480				3,098,623	5,650,425

N B.—In above 21 counties the teams in 1086 are 43,932, *i.e.*, 83 per cent. of the teamlands ; the arable 1897 being 90 per cent. of that in 1086 by 120 acre theory, as above.

ARABLE OF ENGLAND, 1897 (11,602,191 acres).

	Acres.
Grain and pulse crops (all grown 1086) ...	5,780,782
Vetches ...	186,604
Bare fallow ...	369,254
	6,336,640
Green crops (excluding vetches), mostly the food of stock, 1897, almost or entirely uncultivated 1086 ...	2,263,879
Clover, sainfoin and rotation grasses, in arable rotation, partly for hay and partly fed off—entirely the food of stock ...	2,885,863
Flax, hops, small fruit ...	115,809
Total ...	11,602,191

crops as Potatoes, Cabbage, Rape, Mangolds, Turnips, Clover, Sainfoin, and Grasses in arable rotation, so that the present Agriculture is far more remote from that of 1696, than the latter from 1086, and for aught I can discover there was little of food importation T. R. W. I. or T. R. W. III. For 1086, take the population of England at 1,800,000 (Ellis' count  $\times$  by more than 6), and for 1696,  $5\frac{1}{2}$  millions (incl. Wales) from King's estimate from the Hearth Tax (also reckoned at 7 millions; the houses were 1,300,000 at the Revolution, which shows King's cast to have been low); the Lancaster Herald (King) allowed 10 million acres in 1696 in ordinary rotation, the same amount in pasture and meadow, allotting to heaths, moors, woods, and forests more than  $3^{\text{ce}}$  their now extent, and less than  $3^{\text{ce}}$  the present amount of land in towns—a reference to the 1897 Agricultural Returns shows  $11\frac{1}{2}$  million acres arable, and 13 millions in pasture and meadow in England. King gives a total produce of 90,000,000 bushels, of which 17 millions for seed; he estimates 3,200,000 acres barley land, of which one-third (say 1 million) fallow, so 'tis plain he is thinking of a 3 course shift, which allows from 6,666,666 acres under crop, some 73 million bushels for use for  $5\frac{1}{2}$  million folk; this amounts to 13 bush. per head, and between 13 and 14 bush. per sown acre yield, (of which about 3 bush. for seed), so that deducting from the sown acres some 1,166,666 acres for seed, there would be about 1 acre per head,—in other words some  $5\frac{1}{2}$  millions (of the 10,000,000 arable) actually feeding the same no. of folk as found. King's estimate of yield is 13-14 bush. p. ac. (no items save barley at 15 bush.) all round; in 1333-5 from 8 estates of



Merton College (over 1,000 acres for 3 years in different parts of England) Wheat yielded 10, Barley 16, Dredge 14, Rye 11, Oats 10, Peas 11, and Beans 10 bush., or an average of 10-12 bush.; these results have been wrought out from Prof. Rogers' Tables (*Hist. Agr.*) presumably derived from the actual Bailiffs' A<sup>cs</sup>. At this period (1333-5) varying amounts were sown, but from the figures it would appear that about 1 quarter (8 bush.) might be stated as the all round yield (after deduction for seed); against about 10 bush. in 1696. There seems to be no evidence of yield per acre T. R. W.; and no reason to suppose the agriculture of the 11th century (1086) much more futile than that of 1333-5—hence the statement of a supposed yield of 6 bush.\* p. ac. (of which 2 b. for seed) can be supported by nothing unless its author's wish to prove the existence of a fanciful ploughland at any cost (p. 438 *D. B. and Beyond*).

Now no assertion is made as to the correctness of King's figures, but let it be remembered he was a notable statistician living at the period of the Revolution; that an estimate of  $4\frac{1}{4}$  people per house is less than medium, and that his method or calculating the fallow of the barley area, would suggest that rather more than  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the land in tillage was sown.

In 1086, in 30 counties of England there were

\* *D. B. and Beyond*, p. 438, says this hypothesis is taken from Walt. de Henley: what that writer actually says is that a yield of 6 bush. p. ac. means a loss of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  d. p. ac., in addition to the land being rent free (suppose 4d. to 6d. p. ac.): in the same vol. cited by Prof. Maitland, the anonymous and coeval writer on Husbandry gives the returns from wheat as 5 times the seed sown, *i.e.*, 10-12 bush. p. ac., from 2 or  $2\frac{2}{5}$  bush. seed, which yield is similar to the actual figures of the Bailiffs' a<sup>cs</sup>, *ut sup.*

Average yield of Wheat per acre: neither evidence, nor probability in placing it at 6 bushels.

Agricultural data,  
1086.

70,606 ploughs (8 oxen), with an average of 3.56 folk as recorded per team; in 34 counties (including, however, most of Lancs. and parts of Cumberland and Westmorland) the recorded population was 283,242; assuming 300,000 as the total for the 40 modern counties, and ploughs in proportion then would there have been a total of 84,000 teams; for a moment, allow 120 acres of tillage per plough, then would there have been *over* 10,000,000 acres arable in 1086, keeping alive some 1,800,000 folk as against a lesser amount (10,000,000 ac.) for more than 3<sup>ce</sup> that number (*i.e.* 5,500,000 people) in 1696.

Consumption of  
Beer.

Of the 2,200,000 acres sown to barley (yield 15 bush. per ac.), King estimates to malt  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the yield, *i.e.*, 21 $\frac{1}{2}$  million bush. (of 33,000,000), to return a total of 12,400,000 barrels of beer (weak and strong), which allows rather under 1 $\frac{3}{4}$  pints per day per head of population, which amount (about 78 barrels) would be produced from  $\frac{1}{4}$  of that acre, per head, found by taking the statistics of 1696: a result differing largely from Prof. Maitland's  $\frac{1}{2}$  gallon per day for every man, woman, and child, amounting to some 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  gallons per recorded man, which princely munificence might well cause the modern labourer to envy his antecessor in the days of King William. Again, take the 21 counties\* whose teamlands are set forth on p. 401 (*D. B. and Beyond*), and multiply them by 120, with a result of 6,282,480 ac. arable, against 5,650,425 in the present decade, of which latter but 3,098,623 are in the crops of 1086 (the balance mainly being food for stock): and were one to apply 180 acres (Canon Taylor in "*Domesday Studies*"), arithmetic would be set at defiance

\* *Vide*, p. 114.

in some of the shires, whose total area would be unable to furnish the acres required—which result would also sometimes occur if the actual teams (in place of the teamlands) were taken.

How much of the acre per head as thus found from King's tables would be subtracted for stock, there is no material to determine, but Fitzherbert writing t. Hen. VIII. (probably a Derbyshire squire and farmer) does not, if I remember rightly, allow any very considerable proportion of corn for the working oxen. King's estimate for the consumption of Bread, Bread Corn, Cakes, Biscuit, Pastry, Pudding, and all things made of meal and flour is 15s. 8d. per head\* p. a., and 'tis clear he calculates practically all the Wheat and Rye, and part of the Barley, Oats, Beans, and Peas under this item, presumably the produce (by his mode of estimation) of  $\frac{9}{20}$  acre, as roughly by King's figures 14 bush. p. acre (rather less) was the yield from some  $\frac{2}{3}$  of 10,000,000 acres under the plough in 1696, and as in 1333-5, some 11 bush. p. acre (rather more) are found in practice; then should there be, by these figures, some  $8\frac{1}{2}$  million sown acres in 1086 for an assumed population of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  millions (as in 1696); but as the population in 1086 cannot be shown to have exceeded  $\frac{1}{3}$  that amount (*i.e.*, about 1,800,000), then would 2,830,000 sown acres have sufficed, and therefore it is hard to imagine a total exceeding 6,000,000 arable acres, which allows for much of the ploughland being under a 2 course shift,† and some of it

Consumption of Bread-Stuffs, *etc.*

Population of 1696 treble that of 1086.

\* In the *anon.* Husbandry (*c. t.* Hen. III.) farm servants have an allowance of 1 qr. of corn per 12 weeks.

† There is a great deal about 2 and 3 course shifts in Yorkshire (with reference to *gheld* rate) in Canon Taylor's "Ploughland and the Plough," the furrows of which systems

in a rotation partly grass,\* but counted as arable, which presumably would occur in other counties than Cornwall. Hence some 70 acres per plough would follow, and but three score or less might be calculated if the land in grass (in rotation, and estimated as arable) were excluded; and this amount (60 acres) seems to have been Agarde's estimate of a ploughland in Q. Elizabeth's days.†

The well-known Poll Tax Returns 1377, 1379, and 1381 bear on the matter;‡ the population at

are yet to be discovered by the zealous antiquary, and the rotations identified; these arguments (which seem to have little support from D. B.) appear to arise from certain entries (even better represented in Lincs.), where the jurors roughly estimate the teamlands as in proportion to the *gheld* rates; thus 364*a*, 2 $\frac{3}{4}$  bovates for *gheld*, land to 2<sup>ce</sup> as many oxen; 364*b*, 13 $\frac{5}{8}$  bovates for *gheld*, *terra dupliciter ad arandum*; compare 352*a*, 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  bovates for *gheld*, land to 5 oxen, which is similar to the last named, but that it would have seemed singular to write, land to 27 $\frac{2}{3}$  oxen; see also 350*a*, 351*a* (*ter*), 351*b* and 352*a* (*bis*); for cases where the teamland equates the *gheld* 343*b*, 344*b* (*bis*), 348*b* (*bis*), 350*b*, 351*a* (*quinquies*), 351*b*, 353*a*, 358*a*, 362*b*; where the Teamland is half the *gheld* 349*b*; and other simple proportions occur in this county.

*Terra  
dupliciter  
ad  
arandum.*

Meadow,  
1086.

\* Not of course meaning "rotation grasses"; see note, p. 22; also as illustrating meadow, etc., vide *D. B.* 2*b*; as much meadow as pertains to 10 ac. of land; 38*b*; 46*s.* of herbage; 134*b*; land to  $\frac{1}{2}$  pl.; meadow to  $\frac{1}{2}$  pl., and 10*s.* over, a mill of 3*s.* and 200 eels, the whole worth 20*s.*; 142*b*, Meadow 6*s.* and 4*s.* of hay; 143*b*, Mea. to 3 pls., and 20*s.* over; 143*b*, Pasture to stock, and hay to farm of Archbp. for 8 days; 156*a*, of hay 10*s.*; 183*a*, Of mea. 5*s.*, besides pasture to oxen; and 376*b*; the men of N. detain 16*s.* of the customs of the pastures.

† A Ploughland, which is about Three Score Acres; p. 10 App. Reg. Hon. de Richmond.

‡ For 1377, refer to "Archæologia," vol. vii., which gives a more extended return than that published in Powell's

this period seems to have been  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions or more, and the following figures taken from the detailed returns of Claro Wapentake (Yorks) in 1379 suggest omissions:

Poll Tax  
Returns of  
1377 and  
1379.

Per 1,000 of Population, Claro, 1379.				19th cent. Model 1,000 England.	
358	...	...	Men wed	...	273·3
358	...	...	Women wed	...	273·3
284	...	...	Over 16, unwed	...	453·4
<u>1,000</u>				<u>1,000</u>	

the inference being that many over 16 years of age were not taxed as they should have been ; and further, so far as the imperfect returns at the Record Office (of 1377 for Claro) allow comparison, there were in 1379 found to be actually more folk living over 16 than in 1377 over 14, which would seem to point to a not altogether extinct desire on the part of taxpayers to escape payment, rather than to any particular catastrophe in that district. The total of 1377 furnished £22,607 2s. 8d. by 1,356,428 groats from 37 counties from all over 14 years of age, excluding Mendicants, and the Clergy (about 30,000 ; see Clerical Subsidy 51 Ed. III.) ; by allowing for Monmouth, Chester, and Durham, the total population over 14 might be 1,500,000. But as what was true of Claro might be applicable to all England (a recorded excess in 1379 of those over 16, over those over 14 in 1377), it may be reasonable to estimate the 1,500,000 as over 16 and not over 14. On the assumption that there would be 37%

“Rising in East Anglia,” which should also be consulted for 1381, and separate clerical subsidies are to be found in both vols.

of the total population under 16, then would there have been 2,380,000 persons in all England ; but presuming 35% of the total population wed (and noting that in Claro of 1,000 recorded, 716 are found as married), then would there be approximately 1,074,000 wed folk of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  millions as above, which being  $\frac{7}{20}$  (taking 35% of whole community as married) of the total, would bring the population in 1377 to 3,069,000, so that the true total should lie between these estimates, say some 2,700,000, called  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions. Unless the chroniclers are to be regarded as mere relaters of fables, there must have been enormous mortality in 1348-9 (the Black Death); given at  $\frac{1}{3}$  to more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  the population, so that in the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the 14th century the English population might very well be estimated at 4 millions. As the postulaters of the 120 acre theory are burdened with an arable of over 10,000,000 acres in 1086 for some 1,800,000 people, it easily follows that 20,000,000 (on the same theory) would not be an excessive amount for 4,000,000 folk temp. Ed. III. prior to 1348-9, and (still on that theory) some 30,000,000 of arable, *what time* the Saxon estimate\* of 242,700 Hides was made ; after this, it would be but little astonishing to hear that the whole country at one time consisted of a vast ploughed field, and that traces of terrace cultivation had been discovered on Scawfell Pike itself.

The Black  
Death.

Ploughs  
and  
Population  
1086.

Prof. Maitland has counted 70,606 ploughs in 30 of the recorded counties of D. B., which answers to an estimate of 84,130 for the 40 modern shires of England by as follows :—

\* *Vide*, p. 28.

32,544,084 total acres of which 3,759,671 in 5 counties (Cumberland, Durham, Monmouth, Northumberland, and Westmorland,) not in D. B., assuming Lancashire as returned; total recorded population 283,242 (Ellis), expanded to 300,000 for the missing shires, giving 5,586 ploughs for their supposed "recorded folk." Of the 4 counties Prof. Maitland does not give Yorkshire has some 2,959, Rutland 239 teams, and I have assumed 940 for Cheshire, and 3,800 for Suffolk, which with the 5,586 (above) and 70,606 adds to 84,130. The population for Lincs, Norfolk, and Suffolk seems quite untrustworthy (see note, p. 12), and to estimate the number of oxen possessed by the average *villein*, it is therefore necessary to omit them, and take statistics from the 31 remaining counties of D. B.: empirically divide the population into 4 classes, *A*, villans, sokemen, *liberi homines*, coliberts, and *censarii*; *B*, bordars, cottars, and coscez; *C*, *Homines*, radknights, Frenchmen, *milites*, thanes, and drenghs; *D*, the balance, including lords, mesne lords, burgesses, priests, swineherds, Welshmen, reeves, etc.; and assume Class *A* at 3 per plough, *B* at 8, *C* at 1, *D* at no teams save the demesne ones of mediate and immediate lords. This is of course incorrect, as many of the burgesses, priests, etc., had ploughs, but one assumption to a certain extent balances another, and the erudite supporters of the villeins should allow this mode of computation rather increases (unduly perhaps) their *status*: taking the recorded population of the 34 counties, Class *A* consists of some

Fallacy of  
figures in  
some  
counties.

145,009 folk, *B* of 89,443, *C* of 2,360, and *D* of the balance needful to total 283,242; as explained in the note on p. 12, Lincs, Norfolk, and Suffolk would mar the calculation, (and unduly depreciate the *villani*), so it is necessary to subtract their totals, leaving 100,667 in Class *A*, 69,182 in *B*, 2,027 in *C*, and a total recorded number of 210,359 in these 31 counties.

The demesne ploughs are about  $\frac{3}{10}$  of the total (see p. 145), and as there are some 65,179 teams in these counties, the lords thus have 19,554, and the ploughs not in demesne would be 45,625, *i.e.*, 33,556 in Class *A*, 8,648 in *B*, and 2,027 in *C*, leaving a balance of 1,393 which would not cover the omissions, as for burgesses, etc. In other words, suppose 1,000 acres arable in aforesaid 31 counties, thus

Scheme of 1,000 acres arable 1086.	Acres*	Ploughs.	Servi.	Class A, <i>i.e.</i> , Villans, etc.	Class B, <i>i.e.</i> , Bordars, etc.	Class C.
Demesne	400	$4\frac{3}{4}$	$4\frac{1}{2}$	25 at 20— 21 acres each	17 at some 3 acres each	$\frac{1}{2}$
Tenantry	510	$8\frac{1}{3}$				
„	50	$2\frac{1}{8}$				
„	40	$\frac{1}{2}$				
Totals	1,000	c. 16	$4\frac{1}{2}$	25	17	$\frac{1}{2}$

leaving 47 recorded folk as against 16 ploughs,

\* For very precise information as to the modern statute acre, *vide* tables at end of *Chron. W. Thorn* (St. Augustine's), where over 50 variations are given, all conforming to present measures; the above history terminates A.D. 1397.



which is agreeable to the addition of Classes A, B, C, together with the 23,252 Servi (of 31 shires); viz., 195,128 for 65,179 teams, the remaining 15,231 (of 210,359 total recorded) not being necessary to the example, but of course supported by above ploughs, and bringing up the number of people (as found) to the correct figure. This estimate presents the classes in due proportion to each other, and assumes each villan plough will average about half an acre per week, on the lord's land for 10 months, *tilling* some 15-16 acres p. a., as by Walter de Henley's scanty aration.

Prof. Maitland (p. 430 *D. B. and Beyond*) seems to create and then admire at the difficulties of the Norfolk and Suffolk "*Hidages*," with little success in solving them; he rightly observes "that there are upon an average about 2 teams to every carucate is apparent on page after page of the record," and therefore concludes these carucates are not teamlands, falling back on the supposition that they may be units of assessment. There should be little room to suppose they are either *Hides* or *Teamlands* (as Prof. Maitland understands a ploughland, *i.e.*, 120 acres),—to demonstrate the former the Hundred of Thingo is ample, occurring on fos. 286, 289, 349, 356-8, 381, 391, 401, 425, and 435 of D. B. ii., where the villas are assessed to *gheld* in no proportions whatsoever to the number of carucates they contain, as the following approximate list [given in the order in which the villas occur on p. 100, *Feudal England* (Round)] demonstrates:  $7\frac{1}{4}$  carucates, 7d.; 1 car. 6d.;  $5\frac{1}{4}$  c. 6d.;  $6\frac{1}{2}$  c. 20d.; 5 c. 7d.;  $2\frac{3}{4}$  c. 7d.;  $3\frac{1}{4}$  c.  $6\frac{1}{2}$ d.;  $3\frac{3}{4}$  c. 10d.; 3 c. 10d.; 3. c.  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d.;  $6\frac{1}{2}$  c.

Norfolk  
*Carucates*  
not Team-  
lands, nor  
"Hides"  
ad  
*gheldum*,  
but mainly  
areal  
estimates  
of arable  
land.

Proof of  
above  
statement.

$6\frac{1}{2}$ d. ; 4 c. 7d. ;  $2\frac{1}{2}$  c. 7d. ;  $3\frac{1}{2}$  c. 7d. ; 1 c. 6d. ;  $6\frac{1}{2}$  c. 2od. ;  $4\frac{1}{4}$  c.  $13\frac{1}{2}$ d. ;  $4\frac{1}{2}$  c.  $6\frac{1}{2}$ d. ; 6 c. 2od. ; and 5 c. 6od. Prof. Maitland, with needless candour, states that to a knowledge of Agriculture, he does not attain—but founds his historic theories on conceptions (or rather misconceptions,) of that necessary Art, his admissions notwithstanding ; the Abbot of Ely plainly informs (p. 122 *I. E.* in Hamilton's *I. C. C.*) that (c. 1086) he has 83 (67 + 16) carucates of land *plus* 33 acres, land to 191 ploughs, of which  $122\frac{1}{2}$  there, in *Norfolk* ; and 109 (69 + 40) car. of land *plus* 42 (32 + 10) acres in *Suffolk*, where land to 248 ploughs, and  $219\frac{1}{2}$  there, which is good evidence that the teamlands are better than twice the number of carucates. That these carucates are not the usual *fiscal* Hides has just been shown ; besides the assessment to danegeld, etc., is given in quite an unusual form in these counties ; as a *rule* the carucates of *Norfolk* and *Suffolk* seem to be the amount of land that might be under the plough, together with *perhaps* the appurtenances (several meadow and pasture), of a teamland, each carucate computed at 120 acres ; the idea that this amount of land is the work of one plough is unknown to experience, and however practicable it may appear to any *ex cathedrâ* theorist, he is here confronted by the fact that such a calculation is refuted on "page after page" of his record, and by the singular appearance of the statistical consequences of such a surmise. If the carucates of the Ely Manors in either *Norfolk* or *Suffolk* are divided by the Teamlands, the quotient in both

cases lies between 52 and 53 acres—a result which any agriculturist would allow to be reasonable; working from these figures, and estimating for the excess of population as recorded in these counties (*vide* note p. 12), the difficulties named on p. 430, *D. B. and Beyond* disappear, and the ratio of Teamlands to Population appears as it should: see also *D. B.* ii., 169, where the estate of 18 sokemen (always 2 ploughs) is delivered for *a land*; and ii., 171, where 1 Manor delivered for 5 carucates seems to consist of 2 car. *plus* odd acres adding to 362.

Passing to the evidence of Domesday Book and later records, in 1086 (*D. B.*) it sometimes happens that a rough approximation of the area of a Manor or district is given in leugæ, each of which have *Leugæ.* been taken to represent  $1\frac{1}{2}$  statute miles. Thus a Manor one leuga in length by as much in width (by this computation) would contain 1,440 modern acres; no exactness of dimensions can be expected, and of course the reality of rectangular blocks of lands is not postulated. Sometimes one imagines that greatest length and breadth is alluded to; at other times an average, and in most cases the figures seem a rough estimate (the above remarks follow after testing Yorkshire examples by Jeffery's 1770 1" maps); now 3 of the Ripon "mile" <sup>Ripon "mile" crosses.</sup> crosses (Sharow, Bishopton, and Littlethorpe) are about or within 1,760 yards of the Minster (*D. B.*, fo. 303*b*, about the church one leuga), and in the Manor of Hackness (*D. B.*, fo. 323*a*), a modern mile would seem an excessive quantity. A very telling example is given on fo. 303*b*, as to the berewicks of Ripon (6 leugæ in length by as many

“Liberty  
of Ripon.”

in breadth); here it may be stated with absolute certainty that the leuga was nothing approaching  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles; for the whole liberty of Ripon would not comprise 51,840 acres, and the portion of it included in the Domesday berewicks would well answer to a leuga of a modern mile or a trifle less;\* at the same time by taking the greatest length and the greatest breadth a leuga of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles would be found. An example like this on the large scale enables a statement of some certainty that here the leuga was either the modern mile, or else that (if  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles) the greatest and not average length and breadth was taken; and is of far greater worth than rash calculations from assumed perches of 18 to 20 feet, which by the way might reasonably be expected to be derived from the

How esti-  
mated in  
Domesday.

\* Ripon and its Berewicks as given correspond to about half the Liberty of Ripon, the whole of which is considerably less than the area comprised in 6 leuga long  $\times$  6 l. broad, taking 1 leuga as  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles linear measure; by the area of the modern townships with additions the leuga works out just under 1 statute mile; a like explanation may then be reasonably postulated for such entries as would give enormous ploughlands of up to 360 acres on a rectangular block calculation. For the berewicks of Ripon do extend 9 miles by 9 miles (6 leuga  $\times$  6 l.), but that is their greatest length and breadth, from which nothing can be asserted, and as demonstrated the actual area was but about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of such as would be found by multiplying the greatest linear measures; in addition to this it may be held a ploughland contained in itself both pasture (not common of pa.) and meadow of the tenantry, at least for the plough oxen, of which numerous instances may be noted in the Yorkshire I. P. M.'s. (Yks. Record Series), and the Hundred Rolls (vol. ii.); also sometimes houses were on the “ploughland.”

extremities of the "mesurabill" man (Ancient Scotch Laws), and therefore very well short of 12 inches. It may be noted that the marks (some yet in existence) representing the Banleuca of Ripon are locally known as mile crosses, nevertheless on what authority I know not, the Yorkshire Arch. and Top. Soc. have produced a modern ancient map of the county, with a scale rating the leuga at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles, which I venture to think will not be found applicable for areal measurement: however the following examples are wrought from that calculation, estimating a leuga in length by as much in width, as equivalent to a rectangular block of 1,440 acres. It will be observed that a piece of ground of the shape of a right-angled triangle by this computation would contain nothing unless 720 acres, and the nearer the approach to an L shape, the lesser the extent; in many of the cases (below\*) the impossible assumption that the whole Manor was under the plough has been made, for it is not always stated how much of its extent was in wood, meadow, and common of pasture; where given, it is deducted from the total manorial area as shown. For example in Little Smeaton the Manor is given at 1 leuga long by  $\frac{1}{2}$  as much wide, and unspecified underwood contained therein; this cannot be deducted and it is calculated as a rectangular block of land entirely tillage of 720 acres, and 13 teamlands of 55 acres each, or less per actual plough (14 pls.). In the 2nd entry (Berg, *i.e.*, Barugh) no ploughs are

Yorkshire  
Manors.

---

\* See table, p. 129.

named by reason that the Manor was waste ; omitting this the total amounts to less than 5,115 acres, containing 103 teamlands and 121½ ploughs, on an estimate from rectangular blocks raised from

Examples  
therefrom.

\*AVERAGE PER TEAMLAND, 1086 (D. B.), ASSUMING THE SQUARE LEUGA EQUAL TO 1,440 ACRES, AND RECTANGULAR AREAS.

	Orig. fo.	Extent in leugæ.	Acres.	Plough- lands.	Acres per plough- land.	Notes.
Dewsbury	299 <sup>b</sup>	$\frac{1}{3} \times \frac{1}{3}$	160	2	80	4 ploughs there.
Barugh, etc.	303 <sup>a</sup>	$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{4}$	180—7	3	58	7 acres meadow <i>plus</i> un- specified waste.
Welleton, etc.	304 <sup>b</sup>	$1 - \frac{5}{12}$	840	20	42	21 pls. there.
Bulmer	306 <sup>a</sup>	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{7}{12}$	580—20	8	70	10 pls. ; meadow 20 acres.
Farlington	306 <sup>a</sup>	$\frac{1}{6} - \frac{1}{36}$	200—12	4	47	2 pls. ; mea- dow 12 acres.
Fleetham	310 <sup>b</sup>	$1 \times \frac{1}{2}$	720	15	48	9½ pls.
Scruton	310 <sup>b</sup>	$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$	360	10	36	5 pls.
Burton	312 <sup>a</sup>	$\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$	350—(?)	8	less than 44½	14 pls. ; un- specified under- wood.
Sutton Hon- grave	312 <sup>b</sup>	$\frac{5}{12} \times \frac{1}{3}$	200	3	67	4 pls.
Middleton Quernhowe	312 <sup>b</sup>	$\frac{5}{12} \times \frac{1}{4}$	150	3	50	3 pls.
Foston	313 <sup>a</sup>	$\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{18}$	270	4	67½	6 pls.
Smeaton Little	316 <sup>a</sup>	$1 \times \frac{1}{2}$	720—(?)	13	55	14 pls. ; un- specified under- wood.
Tanshelf	316 <sup>b</sup>	$\frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$	360—3	9	40	22 pls. ; 3 acres meadow.
Tadcaster	321 <sup>b</sup>	$\frac{5}{12} \times \frac{5}{12}$	250—16	4	59	7 pls. ; 16 acres meadow.

linear measurements of the leuga ( $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles), which does not greatly flatter the 120 acre theory. Again on fo. 165a D. B. is a clear instance of a teamland of 64 acres; here is 1 Hide which when ploughed contains not unless than 64 acres, and there is one plough; truly a small Hide (for their average areal scope is 300 acres and more), but nothing to show it is a small ploughland, as it is worked not by 2, 4, or 6 oxen, but by one plough.\*

Very similar results follow from an examination of the lands held by the tenantry of the Bishop of Ely, for which reference should be made to the *Inquisitio Eliensis* as well as D. B.; thus under *Cambridge* to each plough of the tenants are in *Wittleseia* 32 acres, *Doddintona* 60, *Litelport* 35, *Stoneteneia* 30, *Stratham*, 50, *Wilbertona* 52, *Lyndona* 80 or 58, *Heilla* 40, *Wisbeach* 56, *Ely* 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ , *Dunham* 45, *Winteworda* 48, *Wickham* 68, *Sutton* 50, and *Wicheforda* 45, and in *Herts*, *Haddam* 28, *Hatfield* 58, and *Chilleshelle* 40, but here a difficulty arises, for the areas ascribed to the tenantry may be rather rateable than real, and also each villein plough will owe to till some of the land of the lord. Now certainly Seebohm,

1 team to  
64 acres in  
Domesday.

Ely  
Manors.

\* It is interesting to note how this passage has been twisted, for in the Rev. Bawdwen's translation he renders it that there are 64 acres when the land is not ploughed; the point seems to be that when you plough the land, you roughly know its measure; but perhaps the most singular misapprehension of any writer on D. B. occurs on p. 71 of Morgan's "England under the Normans," where, referring to 63a, *ipse quoque transportavit ballam et alias domos et pecuniam in alio manerio* the writer suggests this would not be difficult, as the buildings were constructed of wooden boards, etc.

Middlesex  
Villeins,  
and their  
holdings,  
1086.

and more cautiously Prof. Maitland, accept such entries as areal extents, and thereby attach considerable holdings to the villeinage of Middlesex (the average villan here holds 1 virgate, cases of 1 villan with 2 Hides at Hanwell and W. Bedford); now a test case can be found in the Manor of Heruluestune (Harlesden Green, fo. 127*b*, and but once noted in D. B.), belonging to St. Paul's, where are 4 Teamlands, 2 ploughs in demesne, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  plough held by 22 villeins, of whom 12 hold virgates and 10 half virgates. The total in villeinage (assuming each virgate = 30 acres) amounts to 510 acres, against which set 4 oxen, or if the land were fully stocked 2 ploughs, and whether or not 510 acres could be tilled either by 4 oxen, or a couple of ploughs must be left to the sober judgment of any in the least acquainted with practical agriculture. To them it must be clear either that the acres here are rateable, or that they consisted largely of pasture (not improbable owing to proximity to London), or that the virgate in this Manor actually contained but a small number of acres.

Peterboro'  
Villeins,  
and their  
teams,  
1125-8.

Concerning the appended\* tables, the virgate has been taken as 30 acres arable (save Alwoltuna, where 25 ac., see Rot. Hund., vol. ii., p. 638), though ancient evidences do not establish it to have been entirely in tillage; and it may be seen that in 1086 there were 109 $\frac{1}{2}$  teamlands, 104 teams, and 348 recorded folk, against 139 teams and 434 pop. (recorded) in 1125-8, and at the

\* See tables, pp. 132, 133, and note that *Estona* has 12 fiscal carucates in 1086, and 3 hides *ad in Waram*, 1125; co. Leics. being rated both by Hides and Carucates: see note, p. 39.



latter date the ploughs of the sokemen have been added in brackets—the average acres per villein plough (including work on demesne) being 64.

Now it would seem to be an extremely obvious rule that as folk increase more food is required, and consequently more land tilled and ploughs used, but this simple fact would appear to have escaped the attention of philosophers: an argument based on the theory that because in certain Manors in 1222 a mixture of tenants holding by rent and villein services cultivate X acres, their predecessors in 1086 also arated the said X acres, and that therefore the acreage per plough in 1086 may be discovered by dividing the X acres of 1222

Population  
varies as  
Ploughs.

\*1125-28, LIBER NIGER DE MON. SANCT. PETRI DE BURGO.

	County.	Villeins.	Virgates.	Ploughs.	Acres.	Villeins' work on Demesne in Acres.	Total work of Villein Ploughs.	Acres per Villein Plough.	Ploughs in Demesne, 1125.	Arable Acres in Demesne, 1321.
Kettering ...	N'ants	40	40	22	1,200	314	1,434	65	4	300
Tingwell ...	"	33	25½	12	795	34	820	68	2	110
Oundle ...	"	25	20	9	600	144	708	78	3	205
Pilesgete ...	"	8	5	2	150	16	162	81	1+(8)	
Colingham	Notts	20+50	6+10	14	480	90	548	39	2	208
Cottingham	N'ants	17	15	6	450	45	484	80	2	153
Estona ...	Leics	21	21	12	630	50	667	55	2	102
Wermintona	N'ants	49	34½	16	1,035	117	1,123	70	4+(6)	210
Turlebi ...	Lincs	8	4	2 at least	120	12	129	65	1	55½
Alwoltuna	Hunts	29	18	7	450	9	459	66	2	
Totals ...				102	5,910		6,524	64 aver- age.	23+(14)	

N.B.—The 6,524 acres is obtained by adding  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the work on demesne to the tenants' acres, as the demesne is counted as but one ploughing—according to Sir Walter de Henley, in a 3-course shift each acre had  $\frac{4}{3}$  ploughings: the demesne arable of 1321, is of course but an indication of same in 1125, liable to increase or diminution—in 1321 are 460 ac. ar. at *le Bigginge* under Oundle, 260 being *frisca*.

## \* DOMESDAY, 1086, CONTRASTED WITH L.N.P.

Collation  
of some  
Peterboro'  
Manors,  
1125-8,  
with  
Domesday.

Place.		Hidage.	Teamlands.	Ploughs.	Value.	Population.	DETAILS OF POPULATION.			
							Villans.	Bord. and Cott.	Servi.	
Kettering	1086	10	16	1+10	11 li.	34	31	—	—	1 ancilla, 2 mills
"	1125	10	—	4+22	26 li.	52	40	8	—	2 herds, 1 freeman, 1 miller
Tingwell	1086	5½	8	2+7	7 li.	37	24	11	—	2 mills
"	1125	4½	—	2+12	15 li.	43	33	4	—	4 herds, 2 millers
Oundle	1086	6	9	3+9	11 li.	37	23	10	3	1 mill
"	1125	4	—	3+9	11 li.+	43	25	10	—	2 freemen, 6 herds
Pilesgete	1086	6	6	1+11	4 li.	39	9	2	1	26 sokemen, 1 mill
"	1125	3	—	1+(8)+2	14 li.	57	8	1	—	44 sokemen, 2 herds, 1 mill
Cottingham	1086	7	14	2+10	3 li.	44	29	10	4	1 mill
"	1125	5½	—	2+6	12 li.	30	17	7	—	1 mill, 5 freemen
Estona	1086	120.	16	2+8	5 li.	27	10	5	—	12 sokemen
"	1125	3	—	2+12	12 li.	34	21	—	—	1 homo, 2 mills, 11 sokemen
Wermintona	1086	7½	16	4+8	11 li.	36	32	—	3	1 mill
"	1125	8	—	4+(6)+16	10 li.+	60	49	—	—	1 mill, 8 sokemen, 1 clk, 1 freeman
Alwoltuna	1086	5	9	2+7	7 li.	22	20	—	—	2 mills
"	1125	5	—	2+7	4 li.+	36	29	6	—	1 renter
Colingham	1086	4½	14	2+14	9 li.	67	8	20	—	37 sokemen, 2 mills
"	1125	4½	—	2+14	20 li.	70	20	—	—	50 sokemen
Turlebi	1086	1½	1½	1	1 li.	5	1	4	—	
"	1125	1½	—	1+2	3 li.	9	8	—	—	1 priest

Eccentric  
views of  
philos-  
ophers.

by the ploughs in Domesday may at first sight appear plausible, but if one finds the recorded population in 1086 Y and in 1222 2Y, or 2Y *plus*, one can be of no other opinion than that their ingenious author has not mastered the above plain idea as to increase of population, etc. Such an illustration is set forth in a table on p. 288, *English Historical Review*, 1897 (composed by

F. Baring), and the patient reader is gravely informed "he can thus arrive at the exact acreage of holdings 1086," that is, like a modern Charon, by *transfretting* the villans and their ploughs of 1086 on to the acres (by no means all in villeinage) of 1222. Just to exhibit this happy method of enlivening the "bald details" of Domesday, take the cases of Runewell and Cadendone (Domesday St. Paul's, 1222), as cited by our author on p. 288 (E. H. R., 1897); one is told of 240 acres in 1222 (best part of them set to a rent by the way) described as 8 tenants' virgates, and of 8 villans and 8 bordars with  $2\frac{1}{2}$  ploughs here (Runewell) 1086, and invited to believe that therefore the D. B. villans each had 30 acres, working 120 acres per plough. On referring to the Camden Society's vol. (D. B., St. Paul's) the jurors of Runewell state the Hide was formerly computed at 80 acres, but now (1222) it is 120, and that on account of the poverty of some of the villein tenants their holdings had been taken into the demesne; on adding up the occupants of the Manor 1222 one finds 34-38 tenants (not eight as our author suggests, supported by nothing unless his endeavour to tie a virgate to each D. B. villan at all hazards) against 16 in 1086. Turning to Cadendon, by some process of adding up divers sorts of holdings in 1222 what are styled  $24\frac{1}{2}$  "tenants virgates" of 28 acres each (686 ac.) are discovered for 22 D. B. villans (1086)\* who had 6 ploughs, hence 112 acres

Examination of their methods.

\* The writer seems to have been unaware there is further notice of this Manor of St. Paul's on fo. 211a, hence his

per team ; but referring to the records the population noted in 1086 is 29 against over 100 (not  $24\frac{1}{2}$ ), of which some are probably named twice over, so that one certainly cannot credit that where the population had doubled (and more) in 1222, there had been no increase of ploughs over the number given in Domesday.

Utility of  
the philo-  
sophic  
treatment.

After such glaring examples of our author's manipulations, it must be left to the judgment of the candid reader whether or not this mode of work is an abuse or use of Records, but if instructive comparisons are to be made, it is important that none of the essential particulars be omitted. From the following the reader may form his own inferences, and by referring to the originals make any additions of matter bearing on the point ; not wishing, however, to emulate the pea and thimble tactics of a certain school, nothing has been suppressed in the first instance, with a view to prejudice the case.

Manor of  
Alwalton,  
11th, 12th,  
and 13th  
centuries.

The Manor of Alwalton is illustrated 1086 (D. B.), 1125-8 (L. N. P., Camden Soc.) and 1278-9 (Rot. Hund., vol. ii.) ; by turning to the tables above,\* it may be seen that in 1086 are recorded 9 teamlands, 9 ploughs (7 in villeinage) and 22 folk (bordars and servi perhaps omitted) ; in 1125-8, 9 ploughs and 36 people, and in 1278-9 (H. R. no ploughs given) are  $5\frac{1}{2}$  Hides and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  Virgates of land, the virgate 25 acres, at 5 to the Hide ; of which the details account for

figures are incomplete—nevertheless are used here as they serve well enough to illustrate his statistical methods.

\* See pp. 132, 133.

726 acres, *i.e.*,  $5\frac{1}{2}$  Hides,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  Virgates plus one acre, as under :

200	acres arable in demesne
450	„ land by 18 villans of 25 acres each
62 $\frac{1}{2}$	„ „ „ 5 „ „ 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ „ „
13 $\frac{1}{2}$	„ „ „ 34 cottars
<u>726</u>	acres

In addition 2 free tenants hold  $28\frac{1}{2}$  acres, and belonging to the demesne  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre of court and garden, 1 ac. of several pasture with 8 of meadow, and of course (tho' unnamed) presumably some considerable amount of common of pasture, and wood, which if extra manorial the tenants had access to ; the writer is of opinion that several pasture and meadow is included in the villein holdings (the plough oxen would require hay), but has made no deduction on that ground. There are 59 tenants, but 4 are 2<sup>ce</sup> named, and 5 widows in cottages, and as the extent seems a full one, I do not think the record population should be put higher than 50 ; the 18 virgates (450 ac.) seem to appear as the same amount in 1125-8, held then by 7 full and 22 semi-villani, and the 62 $\frac{1}{2}$  acres of 1278-9 might well have been assarted for the support of increasing population since 1125-8, in which there is no mention of them. But I cannot find that one has right in saying that the 756 acres (keeping some 50 recorded folk) in 1278-9 were in cultivation therefore in 1125-8, (keeping 36 people), and that therefore 9 ploughs worked 746 acres then and in 1086 ; even if after the most *ingenuous* manner of the *English Historical*

*Review*, you suppose population may increase or double without a corresponding cultivation, the calculation would work out at nothing unless 83 acres per team.

Attention is also called to the following interesting references from D. B. and the Hundred Rolls (Vol. 2, well indexed):

## HISTON.

Manor of Histon 1086, and 1278.	<i>D.B. Cambridgeshire; Lands of Bp. Lincoln, fo. 190 a and b.</i>							Total Pop.
	Hides.	Teamlands.	Teams.	Villans.	Bord.	Cott.	Servi.	
	$8 + 8\frac{3}{4}$	$3 + 10$	$2 + 9$	18	18	4	4	
	$9\frac{3}{4}$	$2 + 4$	$1 + 2$	10	19	—	—	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	
	$26\frac{1}{2}$	$5 + 14$	$3 + 11$	$28$	$37$	$4$	$4$	$73$

1279. *Hundred Rolls. Vol. II. (pp. 411-13); rough Summary.*

The Abbot of Eynsham holds  $15\frac{1}{2}$  Hides of the Bp. of London.

		Pop.	Acres.
Demesne	$201\frac{7}{8}$ acres arable, 10 ac. mea. ...	—	$211\frac{7}{8}$
Liberi	$46\frac{1}{2}$ ac. by 7 men ...	7	$46\frac{1}{2}$
Villani, etc.	{ 612 ac. (12 each) by 51 men ...	51	612
	{ $83\frac{3}{8}$ ac. by 14 men ...	14	$83\frac{3}{8}$
Crofters	no land named ...	35	—
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		107	$953\frac{3}{4}$

Philip de Coleville holds 11 Hides of the Bp. of Lincoln.

		Pop.	
Demesne	1 Hide 10 ac. mea.	—	1 Hide 10 acres.
Liberi	69 ac. by 10 men ...	10	69 „
Villani	300 „ 30 „ (10		
	each) ...	30	300 „
Cottars	20 ac. by 28 men ...	28	20 „
*Military tenant subinfeudated	...	20	$160\frac{1}{4}$ „
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		88	1 Hide $559\frac{1}{4}$ acres.

\* Items of this holding on p. 138.

Details of above	{	Demesne: 40 ac. (? 1 ac. yard) 40-1			
		1 ac. by 1 free tenant ...	1		159 $\frac{1}{4}$
160 $\frac{1}{4}$ ac.		110 ac. by 11 villani ...	110		or 160 $\frac{1}{4}$ ac.
		8 $\frac{1}{4}$ ac. by 7 cottars ...	8 $\frac{1}{4}$		

The Hidage at both periods totals 26 $\frac{1}{2}$ , but whereas 73 folk are on record 1086; 195 are noted in 1278, and the Inquisition then finds by detail 1 Hide and 1513 ac. of land,—so that there is presumably a balance of land in common of pasture, waste, etc., which inference the D. B. entry (fo. 190a) seems to confirm, for in demesne there were 2 Teams, 3 Teamlands, and 8 Hides; supposing the Hide (not recorded in acres) in 1278 contained 120 acres, then would there have been 1633 (less, as some described as meadow) acres arable, and yet in 1086, with less than half the recorded population, there were 19 Teamlands and 14 Teams.

The Hundred Rolls often set forth the total Hides\* and proceed to give them in detail approximately agreeing at the rate of 120 acres per Hide (or some other stated no. of acres), but in the above the fiscal Hidage of D. B. is given as a heading; and lest the view that such Hides might be answered from land not all arable be thought fanciful, I append the following†:

\* In some cases, however, the Hides of the Hundred Rolls do not seem to correspond with the cultivated area of the Manors described.

† Assumptions that the *fiscal Hide* is of necessity rated on arable alone, merely discovers their authors' lack of acquaintance with Domesday, and that such are of a certain class or historic writers, the brightness of whose genius enables them to expound that record without having read it; but though

Manor of  
Coatham,  
1086, and  
1297.

D. B. 1086. Cambridgeshire, Coatham, Abbot Croyland (fo. 192a); 6 + 5 Hides; 2 + 6 Teamlands; 1 + 6 Teams; 12 Villans, 8 Bordars, 1 Servus, that is 21 recorded folk, also meadow to 8 plough teams, and pasture for the vill stock, and a marsh rated at 500 eels.

Here again are 6 Hides set against 2 demesne teamlands giving rise to suspicion that the marsh

Genius of  
the  
Romantic  
School.

our fountains of learning inspire their votaries with something of the "divine afflatus," those subtle qualifications may, by the simple, easily be mistaken, for the mere manipulations of the *prestidigitateur*; and at any rate the dull path of History is too confined a sphere for talents so impatient of necessary bounds and limits, and better adapted to the more sympathetic regions of Romance, for which their *alma mater* has so adequately equipped them. There are of course genuine students of History, even within the precincts of learning, and one in especial, who *has* shed a particular lustre on a School which stood greatly in need of it, of whom every Yorkshire and English scholar may well be proud, and whose works may justly rank with those of Brady, Dods-worth, Dugdale, Madox, and Rymer. By way of illustration of Hides other than arable in D. B.; for *wood* see 180b, 205a, 212a, 216a, 228a, and 244a; for *castles*, 62b, 248b; for *pasture*, 49b (defends for  $\frac{5}{4}H$ , the King claims  $\frac{H}{2}$  as pa. for his oxen), 65a, 96a, and 104a; for *gardens*, 298a; as in the *forest*, 32a, and 263b; as in *meadow*, 7a (1 jugum at farm, nothing there but 2 ac. mea., worth 10s.), 28b ( $\frac{H}{2}$  and scots for it, but only 10 ac. mea. worth 5s.); and 377b (Warnode of 10 ac. mea.); as *between wood and plain*, 164a and 175b (numbered for 15 H. between wood and plain); the *County of Yorks* generally, where the areas and values of whole Manors, and the woods in them, are often separately computed, the latter as part of the former; also see the *I.P.M.* of Elizabeth Moubrai, where the Manor of Kirkby Malesart contains no arable land, but 2 carucates, the herbage of which, etc., 38 Ed. III.

Fiscal  
Hides do.  
not always  
denote  
Arable  
land.



was both rateably and really within the Hide, which inference is established beyond any reasonable doubt as in 1279 (p. 409, vol. ii., H. R.) "they say that the abbot and convent of Croyland hold and defend in the vill of Coteham 11 Hides as in lands, meadows, pastures, and marshes," and "they hold in demesne of the said 11 Hides, 2 Hides arable, and 5 Hides in meadows, pastures, and marshes\* pertaining to the said vill," and in tenants  $3\frac{1}{2}$  Hides arable.

Marsh  
land Hides.

Now  $\frac{1}{2}$  Hide is unaccounted for, and it may be that the tenants held it as in meadow, pasture, and marsh, or rated against a couple of windmills: of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  Hides arable, 9 free tenants hold 59 acres *plus* (the 2nd best by rent being undescribed as to acres), 44 villeins have 335 acres, and 5 men pay house rent, so possibly the omitted acreage was 26, the amount necessary to bring up the total to 420 acres ( $3\frac{1}{2}$  normal Hides). If the  $5\frac{1}{2}$  Hides of arable are taken at 660 acres, it may be observed there were 8 Teamlands and 7 Ploughs in 1086 with a recorded population of 21, which now

\* In 1086, *arable land* was perhaps worth 2d. (1d. to 3d.) per acre; see D. B., 165*a* (64 ac. ar. worth 16s., formerly 20s.); 197*b* (10 ac. land, 8d.), ii. 3, 118, 260, and 341; also ii. 275 (120 ac. land, and 5 ac. mea. worth 30s.); ii. 94 (80 ac. ar. and 200 ac. marsh worth 20s.); as to *meadow*, 7*a* (2 ac. worth 10s.); 28*b* (10 ac., 5s.), and see note, p. 139; *wood*, 228*a*, worth 10s.; 244*a*, worth 3li. Perhaps land, as per team would be worth 16s. (or less), if the Northern counties were included, but not more than 10s. of this should be set against each plough (8 oxen), leaving the balance against meadow, pasture, woods, and other sources of profit, as jurisdictions, mills, fisheries, etc.

Values of  
Arable,  
1086.

(1278-9) has increased to 58: according to the statistics from D. B. (Ploughs to Recorded Pop.) there would be 16 Teams in the Manor at the later date.

Other  
Manorial  
Examples.

Now these are not isolated instances, as the following if worked out would show: Wodestone, co. Hunts, Abbot of Thorney; Fletton, co. Hunts, Abbot of Peterboro'; Newton, co. Hunts, Abbot of Thorney; Drayton, St. Paul's, Middlesex; referring to D. B. and the Rot. Hund., and in the last case to St. Paul's Domesday (Camden Soc.).\*

It often occurs that the Hundred Rolls estimate the arable demesne in carucates (as where it was out of the Hide), and this may be 120 acres; indeed Seebohm has given an instance of one of 200 acres, (Eng. Vill. Comm.) but on turning to the record (p. 328 H. R.) it runs "1 carucate of land which contains 10 score acres of land, meadow, and pasture," and I believe the following are all the entries in co. Beds.

Bedford-  
shire  
Carucates.

160 acres.	120 ac.	100 ac.	80 ac.	60 ac.	Total	Average.
$\frac{1}{2}$ car.	$5\frac{1}{2}$ c.	6 c.	8 c.	5 c.	25 car.	} 91 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres per carucate.
80 ac.	660 ac.	600 ac.	640 ac.	300 ac.	2280 ac.	

Thus it will be seen the carucate was a variable quantity, hitherto ingeniously explained by the

\* The Hundred Rolls are useful for 5 counties only, and of these Church Lands are most suitable for comparison, owing to the great changes in ownership and partition of lands since 1086, in addition summing up the items in 1278-9 is a troublesome process, and likely to be interrupted by gaps: it is of course open for any one to demonstrate the 120 acre theory by the same method, if they have luck enough to find the least confirmation of it by a just comparison.

relative lightness or heaviness of the soil ; this I believe has little to do with the matter, as fewer or more oxen and horses would be used, instances of which can be seen generally in the fields now-days, and occur so numerously in custumals, etc., as to need no specification. In a certain sense the ploughland was 120 acres, that is examples are taken from the demesne not from the land in villeinage, and as the Bedford table shows the greatest no. of acres hit that amount (660 acres in 120 acre lots), but this is nothing to the point, for the variability of the carucate alone should indicate its meaning (missed by at least every modern writer), *i.e.*, that these demesne ploughlands were such varying amount of land as one plough of the lord tilled with the assistance of his tenants ; for proof of which the following may be taken, all from the Ramsey Cartulary (Rolls Series), 1251 contrasted with Rot. Hund. 1279, and other records, being the only\* returns which I have been able to discover, where the aid of the villein teams is estimated in ploughs per annum, and all here set down :

Proof that demesne Carucates were not tilled by One Team.

<i>Inquisitions 1251-2 Ramsey Cartulary.</i>				<i>1279 Hundred Rolls.</i>
	Demesne.	Assistance.		
St. Ives ...	3 ploughs	equal to 3 ploughs		3 carucates in dem.
Halliwell ...	2 "	" 1 pl. <i>plus</i>		2 " "
Wardeboys ...	4 "	" 2 ploughs		3 " "
Ripton Abbas	5 "	" 2 "		5 " "
Broughton ...	4 "	" 2½ "		4 " "
Upwode ...	7 "	" 3 "		not found.
Wistowe ...	4 "	" 2 pl. <i>plus</i>		4 carucates in dem.
	<u>29 pls.</u>	<u>say 16 pls.</u>		

\* *Rot. Norm.* 6 John ; the precatations *alone* worth 1 plough (that is *per an.*) in Ashby de la Zouche, co. Leic.

Ramsey  
Manors.

Assistance  
from  
ploughs  
of the  
*Customary*  
tenants.

Except Upwode all these places may be found in the Hundred Rolls under Hunts, and in all of the 6 cases there is complete agreement, save in Wardeboys, where there were 4 demesne ploughs in 1251 against 3 carucates in 1279: the total assistance to 29 demesne ploughs in seven Manors is 16 ploughs (as by villeins), the  $\frac{1}{2}$  plough being made up of two cases of *et amplius*; now the average demesne carucate in Beds has been shown to be  $91\frac{1}{5}$  acres, which as above would leave about 60 for the plough of the lord, and the rest ( $31\frac{1}{5}$ ) for that of the tenant. On p. 629 (Rot. Hund., vol. ii.) under Westone the Abbot (Ramsey) holds in demesne 8 carucates of land *together with the assistance of his customary tenants* which said demesne contains 548 acres, which can mean nothing unless that his own ploughs together with the assistance of his tenants equal 8 ploughs and suffice for 548 acres, or else that there were in demesne 8 ploughs in addition to assistance from the villeinage. The Manor of Weston (as cited above 1279) contained the hamlets of Brington and Bitherne in which were 4 demesne teams 1086 (D. B.), and as many as 7 temp. Hen. I. (Ramsey Cart.) and unfortunately there are no further records of the ploughs there till 1279.

Of the 7 Hunts Manors in the table, all (save Broughton perhaps) were out of Hide in 1086, at *St. Ives*, 3 demesne ploughs, 1086, at *Haliwell* 2, and 2 temp. Hen. II., at *Warboys* 3 and 3 temp. Hen. II., at *Ripton Abbas* 2, at *Upwode* 2 and 4 temp. Hen. II., at *Broughton* 4 and 4 temp. Hen. II. and at *Wistowe* 2, and 3 temp. Hen. II.

In 1232 (*ex Rot. Mai. Archiep. Gray. In dorso*

No. 64) the Archbishop of York leased to the Prior and Convent of Hexham the demesnes there for a term of 15 years, to be returned in the same condition as received as to crops and fallow; the total being  $179\frac{1}{2}$  acres of arable land in 9 fields or portions of fields (all specified), of which 78 acres in Oats,  $51\frac{1}{2}$  in Wheat, and 50 in bare fallow (*terra warrecanda*), together with the precatons of ploughs and harrows of the tenantry, and with pasture for 16 oxen, and ploughbote for the draught of 2 ploughs—so that here were 90 acres per demesne plough, part of which 90 acres the villinage would cultivate.

Lease of  
Hexham  
demesne,  
1232.

Again in 1292 (Malmesbury Reg. Rolls Series) a lease was made by the Abbot to the cook 20 Ed. I. April of *le Blakelound* consisting of 105 acres sown (fallow not named) to wit 62 of wheat, 11 barley, beans, and vetches, and 32 of oats, together with 10s. of pasture, 10s. of customary works, 16 oxen, 2 horses, ploughs (*caruc'*), and 2 harrows, etc.\*

Lease of *le*  
*Blakelound*  
1292.

Further, in 47 Hen. III. (I.P.M. Yorks Record Series), in the I.P.M. of Baldwin de Insula, there are at his Manor of Harewood 279 acres arable in demesne worked by 3 teams, nevertheless immediately follow the plough services of the tenantry on those acres equal at least to tilling 130 of them once over, so that tho' he may have 3 ploughlands of 93 acres each, and 3 ploughs in demesne, this is nothing to the purpose in the matter of actual work of one plough. Also in the same vols.

Manor of  
Harewood,  
47 Hen. III.

\* The deed cited in the Malmesbury Reg. just before this one makes clear that *caruc'* means ploughs here—and not a plough—presumably two.

Rochester  
Carucates.

in another inquisition 'tis noted that each sokeman must bring to the work of the lord at the rate of one plough for every 4 bovates held in socage. Not that a carucate of land in demesne always means the amount of land which corresponds to the number of ploughs the lord holds, for in the *Reg. Roff.* on cross-examination the bailiffs of the Manors state the number of dominical teams, and also that they have not as many carucates of land, because there are not in those Manors the number of acres which by custom of the district would make corresponding carucates, and further it must be remembered that this word is sometimes used for fiscal (not areal) units, as in the carucated counties in Domesday, and in Kirkby's Quest, the Books of Knights' Fees, and of Aids for Yorkshire, also sometimes in I.P.M.s.

A.D. 1086, NINE COUNTIES TABLE FROM D. B.

Proportion of teams in demesne, 1086.	Teams.	Lords'.	Tenants'.	Percentage of latter.	Villeins,* etc per Plough.
Bucks ...	2056 $\frac{3}{4}$	689 $\frac{1}{4}$	1367 $\frac{1}{2}$	66 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.1
Dorset ...	1826	752 $\frac{1}{2}$	1073 $\frac{1}{2}$	58 $\frac{3}{4}$	2.5
Glos'ter(T.)	3909	1058 $\frac{1}{2}$	2850 $\frac{1}{2}$	72	1.37
Herts ...	1369 $\frac{1}{2}$	475	894 $\frac{1}{2}$	65	2.0
Kent ...	3141 $\frac{3}{8}$	697 $\frac{3}{4}$	2443 $\frac{5}{8}$	77 $\frac{3}{4}$	2.7
Middlesex	546	152	394	72	3.0
Oxon ...	2461	818 $\frac{1}{2}$	1642 $\frac{1}{2}$	66 $\frac{3}{4}$	2.2
Rutland ...	238 $\frac{5}{8}$	43 $\frac{5}{8}$	195	82	3.75
Yorks ...	2958 $\frac{7}{8}$	782 $\frac{3}{8}$	2176 $\frac{1}{2}$	73 $\frac{1}{2}$	2.33

\* The result arrived at by dividing the number of villeins in the county by the *tenants'* ploughs, as the latter are owned by as well *villani* as others, the quotients of course are usually far too low.

Seebohm appears to have made a nice approximation to cultivated England in 1086 at 5 million acres for the recorded counties, which if I understand the *Village Community* rightly is as under :

108,407 villans with	2,250,000 acres and ploughs.	Estimate of England, 1086, in the <i>Village</i> <i>Com-</i> <i>munity</i> .
23,000 sokemen with	500,000 „ „	
12,000 liberi homines with	500,000 „ „	
In demesne	1,500,000 „ „	
89,000 bordars and cottars	250,000 „ and no ploughs.	
	<u>5,000,000 acres.</u>	

counting  $\frac{1}{2}$  as many ploughs of 4 oxen as villans, and at that rate, the normal villan holding 30 acres and having 2 oxen (p. 85), altho' he allows his average villan of D. B. with 21 acres the same (?) number, but more or less on a scheme of 8 oxen to 120 acres. This infallibly breaks down in detail when tested, for as evidenced by the figures for 9 counties, the lord had at least  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the total ploughs in demesne, and in the recorded counties were some 78,000 ploughs (see pp. 121-2); supposing therefore Seebohm's method, which I gather to be that the demesne ploughs were of 8 oxen, and the tenants' ploughs of 4,\* then would there be 12,500 large ploughs of the lords for 1,500,000 acres, and

In some  
respects  
unreliable.

---

\* The following examples do not necessarily, but may sometimes illustrate actual husbandry in 1086: D. B. — *one ox* in plough, 211a; *two oxen*, 22a, 264b, 307b, ii. 184; *two and a half oxen*, twice, but in the same place, see 358a; *three oxen*, 49b, 110b; *four oxen*, 366a (only time found, but half a plough *passim*); *five oxen*, 14a, 235a, 278b, 293b; *six* Oxen per team the standard of Domesday.

58,333 small ploughs for the 3,500,000 complementary acres; that is, 70,833 (*i.e.*,  $41,666\frac{2}{3}$  only by the method of *D. B.*) teams for 5,000,000 acres arable, and more particularly 37,500 four-ox ploughs for 2,250,000 acres held by villeins, at the rate of about 3 villeins per 4 oxen, which is not agreeable to what he has written about the *gebur* and normal villein being stocked with a couple of oxen.

Bordars  
often had  
plough  
oxen, 1086.

There seem to be several sources of error, for the 9 counties table demonstrates the lords' teams were 30% of the total, and as their scope was more considerable than that of those of the tenantry, there might well be some  $\frac{2}{5}$  of the total arable in demesne; also the bordars contributed to the ploughs by the witness of Domesday (fo. 303*b.*, two bordars with one plough\*—no other tenants named; and often together with the villeins), and as already shown the evidence from it is against the teams being other than 8 oxen, that is to wit, whatever the actual mode of husbandry, the teams seem to be reckoned in units of 8 oxen.

Method of  
Table of  
Nine  
Counties.

In the table of 9 counties, Taylor's Domesday Analysis furnishes *Glos'ter*, and the rest are on the author's responsibility; all ploughs not in demesne are counted on the other side, so that ample correction should be made for the villeins†

*oxen*, 71*a*, 206*a*; *seven oxen*, 286*b*; *eight oxen* (not found nor to be expected); *nine oxen*, 359*b*; and *ten oxen*, 366*a*.

\* See note on p. 11 for instances selected from 20 counties.

† The following 64 references from *D. B.* illustrate the *Villani* of 1086: as *equated to sokemen*, 209*b*; as *under sokemen*,



per plough, which, as they can seldom be disentangled from bordars and sokemen, cannot be done with precision. The casts differ somewhat

ii. 392 ; as *paying forfeits*, 17*b* ; as *chattels* (bore away a rustic who was remaining on 1 virg.) 30*a* ; as *holding land at farm*, 127*b* ; as *paying tithes*, 38*a* ; *freeman who had  $\frac{H}{2}$  now a villan*, ii. 1 ; as *witnesses*, 44*b* (*de villanis et vili plebe*), and ii. 393 ; as *rent payers*, 52*b* (10*s.* p. ann.), 182*a* (18 villans, 6 bord., and 1 priest render 18*s.*), 263*a* (1 villan, 8*d.*) ; as *fractional persons*, 110*b* ( $\frac{1}{2}$  a villan), 168*a* (7 half vill.), 196*a* ( $1\frac{1}{2}$  vill.), and 252*a* (4 whole, and 6 half vill.)—the partition seemingly in reference to amount of services due ; as *paying relief on royal Manors*, 30*b* (20*s.*), 181*a* (an ox) ; as *paying gheld*, 203*a* ; as *rendering custom*, ii. 5 (a villan had  $\frac{H}{2}$  and rendered custom) ; *certain villans quit from all thing of the Sheriff*, 30*b* ; as *holding or having held lands*, 26*b* (the villans held it T. R. E.) ; 40*a* (the like) ; 41*b* (41 vill. hold and held it) ; 41*b* (28 vill. hold and held it ; no hall) ; 73*b* (the villans hold it) ; 175*a* (the land was of the demesne of the villans) ; and 273*a* (other 3 carucates of land are of the villans) ; as *with specified boldings*, 12*b* (30 vill. held 4 solins, T. R. E.), 29*a* (1 vill. holds and held 1 virg.), 192*a* (8 vill.,  $7\frac{1}{2}$  ac. each), 198*b* (5 vill. hold 25*s.* worth of land), ii. 3 (1 vill. holds 30 ac., another 15 ac.), ii. 5 (1 vill. had  $\frac{H}{2}$ ), and in Hanwell and West Bedfont, co. Midd., are 3 vill. with 2 Hides each, the highest amount writer has found (see p. 131) ; as *to Status*, 41*a* (a certain prefect held  $5\frac{3}{4}$  Hides, 2 of them as a villan), 41*a* (Aluric held 3 virg. as a villan), 68*a* ( $5\frac{1}{2}$  Hides held by men of the church serving as villans), compare 175*a* (making services as other freemen), 269*b* (thanes working as villans), and ii. 145 (6 free villans) ; as *to Servile work*, 17*a* (the burgesses worked like vill. at the court), 166*a* (the reeve has  $1\frac{1}{2}$  villans), 182*a* (the men of another vill labor in this one), 246*b* (8 burgesses working as other villans), and 291*b* (the work of the villans pertains to Saxebi in Lincs.) ; as *to number of plough oxen* varying from none to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  pls. to 3 villans (182*b*), which may be compared with 180*a* (1 bordar, 1 pl.), —in certain cases it might appear the villan had 2 pls., but such (21*b*, 317*a*, and 327*a*—Hugh has 1 vill. and 2 pls.)

*Villani*  
illustrated  
from  
Domesday.

from Prof. Maitland's, who claims no minute accuracy for his great industry ; at the same time let not his statement detract from their worth for practical ends, as his tables are of the utmost value, and based, so far as I have discovered, on a sound knowledge of Domesday's method, which entitles his work to the grateful acknowledgment of all interested in our ancient Record.

Yorkshire  
Agriculture  
from the  
1297 Sub-  
sidy Rolls.

An example offers in the 1297 Subsidy (Vol. 16 Yorks Record Ser.) where from the editor's epitome in the Introduction are 1,044 oxen and 681 horses, against just under 5,000 qrs. of corn

seem to be instances where the lord is whole or part owner ; the following show extreme cases as found : 115*a* (1 vill., 1 pl.), 164*b* (15 vill., 15 pls.), 185*a* (1 vill., 1 pl.), 325*a* (1 vill., 1 pl.), 327*b* (1 vill., 1 pl.), and 323*a* (5 vill., with  $\frac{1}{2}$  pl.), 328*a* (10 vill. 2 bord. with 1 pl.), 353*a* (11 vill. with 1 pl.), and frequently with none ; as *to sowing the lords' land with their own seed*, 174*b* (*bis*), 179*b* (36 vill. 10 bord. plough and sow 80 ac. wheat, 71 ac. oats), and 180*a* (238 vill. ploughed and sowed 140 ac. ; now 224 pl. and sow 125 ac.), which Prof. Maitland gives as instances (p. 57, 'D.B., and Beyond') of the light work of the 1086 *villani*, omitting to observe that it is not the fact of ploughing the demesne (matter superfluous to record), but of sowing the ploughed acres with their own proper seed, which is worthy of note—thus in A.D. 1124 (A.S. Chron.) the acre's seed of wheat (2 bush.) sold at 6s., that of barley (3 bush.) at 6s., and that of oats (4 bush.) at 4s. in a very dear year, whereas the cost of aration would scarcely exceed 2d. per acre. That the *villani* did not till as much demesne land in 1086 as in the thirteenth cent. follows as a matter of mere necessity, by reason that they had fewer ploughs and less land (actually, and also relatively in proportion to the demesne) at the former period ; the demesne ploughs then were probably some  $\frac{3}{10}$  of the total, and the lords' arable presumably  $\frac{2}{5}$ —of course these proportions would be quite inapplicable to the latter period (see p. 152).

and pulse, when a Michaelmas taxation was ordered to be made on all the goods in the house and fields; taking the oxen alone (on the 120 acre theory), there would be some 15,000 acres tillage, and if but 8,000 of them had been sown, a return of 5 bush. p. acre: as some  $\frac{4}{5}$  of the crop was oats, 4 (of 5) bush. would have to be kept for seed, nor is it very unlikely that some of the horses were joined in the plough, which would further increase the area and lessen the yield per acre. There were but 370 qrs. (say  $\frac{1}{13}$  of sown crops) of wheat (*frumentum*), 465 qrs. rye (*siligo*),\* and 102 $\frac{3}{8}$  qrs. of barley, which if all malted would but yield about 18 gallons p. annum per record man, and makes out but poorly in comparison with Prof. Maitland's 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  gallons per day for same: in conclusion it may well be allowed that the tax-payers would probably better conceal their corn than live stock, but scarcely to the enormous extent needful for the above supposition.

In the E. H. R. (V. 9, pp. 417-439) Prof. Maitland has very handsomely recorded the results of a search in divers records relating to the Manor of Wilburton, with a result of perhaps the best article on Mediæval† Agriculture extant (at any rate known to the writer): this paper alone would prove the unreality of the 120 acre theory, and as

Manor of  
Wilburton.

\* The accomplished editor (Wm. Brown, B.A.) turns the rye into wheat, and then explains the absence of the former: the point is not what a word may sometimes mean, but what it represents in a particular record, taking into consideration the sense and date.

† Walt. de Whytleseye's *Hist.* containing extents of over a score of Manors, discovers their structure far more lucidly than the usual *modern* explication.

the evidence (quite unconsciously of course) is given by an author who is at great pains to support the opposite (*D. B. and Beyond*), an epitome of the matter in aforesaid magazine is here appended.

In 1086 (*D. B.*) the Manor of Wilburton had 3 ploughs in *Demesne*, in 1277 there were 216 acres arable; *t. Ed. II.* 4 ploughmen (*i.e.*, 2 ploughs), and 128 acres reaped; in 1426, 246 acres arable: as to the *Villeinage* in 1277 were  $15\frac{1}{2}$  full lands, of 24 acres each, total 372 acres, which Prof. Maitland particularly notes as being equivalent to statute ones; *t. Ed. I.* for winter and spring ploughing were due from each full land one *ploughing* (the work of one man for one day, but each 2 ploughings reckoned as 1 diet) per week for 28 weeks (30 less 2 at Christmas)—total by theory 434, and noted as actually done in 4 consecutive years, 420 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 406, 377, 406,—say 400 winter and spring ploughings p. a. The amount of ploughing not being given, let it be supposed that 2 ploughings (*i.e.*, the work of 2 men for 1 day) yield an acre; then (*t. Ed. I.*) are some 200 acres (once ploughed) performed by the villein teams alone, taking no account of 5 free tenants, who owe 5 days' tilling each. In 1381 the full lands each owed 1 day's *Somererthe* (1 acre per day), 2 days' *Nederthe* (1 acre, as  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre each day), and *all* the tenants owed 2 boon ploughings (bringing all the oxen they had), which latter with almost certainty they may have been said to owe *t. Ed. I.*; in *t. Ed. II.* Prof. Maitland states that about 5s. per an. (2d. a plough each day) was expended as *regards*, for the boon ploughers

Details  
from it  
refute  
scholastic  
theories of  
Agriculture.

for their 16 (*sic*) ploughs : the above can leave no room to doubt that at least half of the 216 arable acres of the demesne was completely tilled by the tenantry, leaving at most 108 acres for the 4 hired ploughmen named *t. Ed. II.*, and further the husbandry here must have been far more thorough than that set forth in Walter de Henley's work on Agriculture, as each acre at Wilburton would on an average be ploughed twice or more, instead of the almost incredibly scanty aration of the *bailiff knight*.

The Kentish Manors of Rochester Cathedral (Custumal Reg. Roff. 1290-1320 A.D., publ. 1788) illustrate the note on p. 149 of this vol., and the following table demonstrates that in them (1290-1320) the demesne teams are practically the same as Domesday, whereas those of the villeins have more than doubled,

<i>Ploughs (1086).</i>		<i>Manors.</i>	<i>Ploughs (1290-1320).</i>		Rochester Manors 1086, and c. Ed. I.
Dem. Ten.			Dem. Villeinage.		
1	12	Southfleet ...	2	18	
5	11	Freundesberie ...	4	28	
1	1	Deintonia ...	1	3½	
2	4	Stokes... ..	1½	4½	
2	6	Wldeham ...	2	6½	
6	14 + (? 1)	Heddenham (co. Bucks)	7	48	
17 + 49 = 56			17½ + 108½ = 126		

and further it may be noted that in *Southfleet*, 25 juga plough 50 acres, besides 2 precatations (of 1 acre per plough), total 86 acres ; *Freundesberie*, 21 juga plough 21 + 16 acres ; *Deintonia*, 3 juga, 3 acres plough 6 acres and 6 *quartulas* ; *Stokes*,  
Plough services due therefrom, at latter period.

9 juga plough 9 acres ; *Wldeham*, 10 jugas each 2 acres per plough, and  $6\frac{1}{2}$  jugas (of the 10) a further  $6\frac{1}{2}$  acres ; precatations only noted in *Southfleet*, but perhaps demandable in the other Manors. 68 juga therefore possess  $60\frac{1}{2}$  ploughs, or 1 plough to 45 acres, and in no case more than 4 acres recorded as done in addition on the demesne: that the *jugum* is computed at 40 acres is obvious from entries on p. 6, thus—2 juga pay 8*id.* gavel,  $\frac{1}{2}$  jugum 2*od.*,  $8\frac{1}{2}$  acres  $8\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*, 3 juga and 14 acres 11*s.* 2*d.*,\* etc.: from p. 10 it appears the reeve must be a virgater (*Heddenham*, co. Bucks), and during office has 4 oxen in the lord's pasture.

Agricultural  
details of  
the 12th  
and 13th  
centuries.

I would further submit that tenants of 2 virgates may easily be rated at 8 oxen, of 1 v. at 4 oxen, and of lesser quantities, in proportion (more or less), at any rate in the 12th and 13th centuries, and that these amounts were sometimes exceeded, in support of which as follows. In the *Burton Chart*. A.D. 1114 (p. 30 *Wm. Salt Soc. Coll.*, *Staffs*) a note of 4 virgates *inland*, that is land of 2 pls. which are there with 16 oxen ; in 1189 custumal of *Glastonbury* (*Roxb. Soc.*) men of 3, 5, 10 acres, and  $\frac{1}{2}$  virgate all plough at precatations (pp. 22, 61-2), a 3 acre man to join his ox if he has one (p. 28) ; 17 virgaters to plough each with 8 oxen (p. 123), and in a later custumal of

---

\* The rate is of course 1*d.* per acre, but (as may be observed from the note on pp. 8, 9, in this vol.), the most simple agricultural arithmetic is apt to bewilder the erudite,—hence an explanation (deemed advisable to clear the morning mists from the *learned* mind) which for the ordinary reader would be esteemed entirely superfluous.

the same Abbey A.D. 1235-61 (Somerset Rec. Soc.) 17 *three acre men* are each to come with their plough and what oxen they have (p. 204); 18 *five acre men* each with one ox or more if possessed (p. 78); 13 *ten acre men* each with a plough and what oxen he has (p. 74); 9 *half virgaters* are to plough and find 2 oxen each (p. 130); 13 ditto each to join their oxen for ploughing (pp. 149-150); 2 ditto each with 4 oxen if owned (p. 182), and 20 ditto each to plough with 8 oxen if possessed (p. 210), 21 *virgaters* each if he has 8 oxen (p. 51), to find 4 oxen (p. 82), 50 ditto each if he has a full plough to himself (p. 108); 9 ditto each if he has a full plough (p. 165), with 8 oxen if he has them (p. 189), to find 8 oxen and himself with a rod superintend his ploughmen (p. 210); a  $\frac{1}{2}$  *Hide man* (given  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre man, an obvious slip) to come with ploughs (p. 133); and one with 2 *virgates plus 10 acres* to be beside his ploughs at precatations (pp. 83-4). On p. 141 of the 1189 custumal occurs as under: "Walter de Hennelea holds 1 virgate for 8s., and ought 9 times in the year to plough on his lord's land, with a whole pl. if he has it, and with  $\frac{1}{2}$  pl. if he has not unless half, and with 2 oxen if he has no more"—and three others likewise hold and work as said Walter. It will be observed the name is the same as that of the *Dominus* whose exposition heads this chapter, and whom Prof. Rogers was the (or one of the) first to exploit; this *find* seems to have had "no luck" in its exponents, and the discoverer cannot but have smiled at the discomfiture of his compeers in

their interpretation of "La Dite de Hosbanderye"; as himself (p. 75, *Six Centuries*, etc., Rogers) remarks, "By this he means, not that a team is engaged in ploughing all the year round, but that if it were so engaged, it would cover the space of an acre a day," and further, the same writer assesses the Manor of Cuxham, known to have 3 ploughs at 250 acres or thereabouts (*Hist. Agr.*), and not at 160-180 multiplied by three; nevertheless, after pointing out the remark cited (p. 75, *Six Centuries*) I have been informed that certainly Rogers assumes 240 acres ploughing per team, the truth of which must be left to the judgment of any candid reader.

Demesne  
ploughmen  
had divers  
duties.

These customals (Glastonbury as cited) show the fallacy of supposing that the ploughmen spent every hour of the week days in 44 weeks in continued aration; and also the status of the *carucarii* as being often 3-5 acre men (*passim*), and once  $\frac{1}{2}$  virgaters (p. 70 *Som. Rec. Soc.*); and the cessation of villein services for 3-4 weeks at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, is matter notorious (*Ramsey Chart.*, *Boldon Buke*, *St. Paul's Domesday*), and further, the teamsters had to work their own land. Bad weather and frost stopped ploughing (it seems necessary to make this statement explicitly; see *Ramsey Chart.*; p. 64 *Roxb. Soc.*; pp. 12, 65, 160 *Som. Rec. Soc.*), and in the later Glastonbury record both holder and driver are noted to have the private use of the lord's team for one day in the week, by turns each (pp. 70, 94, 217); for 2 out of every 3 Saturdays (p. 63); further, the ploughmen carry hay and prepare the lord's malt



(p. 94), and work in the harvest field (p. 167 ; also in the appendix to Hatfield's Survey *circa* 1348, under Bailiff's A/<sup>cs</sup>, and in the Manor of Gravesend, see Cruden's History of same), and thresh in the barn (Bailiff's A/<sup>cs</sup> in Hatfield's Survey, Surtees Soc.), and by negative evidence of the last named reference, harrow and set out and spread dung, as these items are not burdened on the account.\*

Nowadays broadly speaking every 100 acres of land (47 arable, 53 grass) has some 4 men, but in 1086 there were not unless 3·56 of recorded population per team ; if each ploughland really had been 120 acres arable, and if all those noted were actually manual labourers (an extravagant postulate), then would there have been but 3 men per 100 acres all arable, and none whatever for the work of pasture and meadow. Now altho' the crops then raised do not compare with the present yield, it must be borne in mind for each 8 and 4 ox plough 2 men would be engaged (all the year round as by theory), and if ploughs of 2 oxen are to be considered, at least at the rate of 4 men occupied in tillage per each 120 acres, which exceeds the 3·56 found ; whereas at this present one ploughman would (in the North at least) usually suffice each team ; and further the mowing machine surpasses the scythe, the reaper the hook, the steam threshing-machine the flail, and

Impracticability of the current *School* theory.

---

\* Harrowing is sometimes noted, but where not accounted for, the presumption is that the servants of the Manor performed the operation.

so forth as to other labour saving economies unknown T. R. W. Then supposing 3.56 men really did work 120 acres arable *plus* the supplemental grass land, it is difficult to conceive how at hay time and harvest the  $1\frac{1}{2}$  men (for by hypothesis the other two are ploughing) even with the assistance of women, etc., would get in the crops, and supervise the stock at pasture; whereas it appears that in 1348-9 (Bailiff's A/<sup>cs</sup> Manor of Quaringdon) a harvest of some 160 acres was got in in 4 weeks (23 days) by 8 hired men in the 1st and 2nd weeks, 40 in the 3rd, and 20 in the last, at a cost of 5d. and 4d. per day per man, with doubtless unnoted assistance from women, etc.

Manor of  
Cuxham.

In the Manor of Cuxham (7 Ed. I., Rot. Hund., and 26 Ed. I., Rogers' Hist. Agr. citing Survey) were 2 carucates of land in demesne with works of 8 half virgaters in 1279, but in 1317 (Bailiff's A/<sup>c</sup>), and 1332-1350 (Rogers' Hist. Agr. presumably from uncited A/<sup>cs</sup>) were 3 ploughs cultivating a varying acreage of some 170 sown acres, which Rogers has extended by fallow as 232 ac. (1332-3), and 258 ac. (1350-1), which of course is an estimate.

Manor of  
Cotum.

In the Manor of Cotum (Bailiff's A/<sup>cs</sup>, 1348-9, Hatfield's Survey) were in demesne 27 oxen, 4 horses, 6 ploughmen, and at least 3 pls. (six or more noted in the A/<sup>c</sup>), 189 sown acres by weeding, and by seed A/<sup>c</sup> 69 ac. Wheat, 110 ac. Oats *plus* some 4 qrs. of Peas sown; in c. 1377-80 (Hatfield's Survey) the total arable is returned as 242 acres.

In the Manor of Quaringdon (same ref. date

1348-9) were in demesne 27 oxen, 3 horses, 6 ploughmen, at least 3 pls. (others named in A/<sup>c</sup>) with 164 acres by reaping, and by seeding 66 acres Wheat, 88 ac. Oats, and 9 sown bush. of Barley but no fallow defined; the gaps and omissions in these A/<sup>cs</sup> do not give sufficient data for the other Manors.

Manor of Quaringdon.

The areal carucate as shown varied from 60 to 160 acres (H. R., 1279) in co. Beds, but in St. Paul's Domesday (Camd. Soc.) in 1222 are 720 acres in demesne by 3 pls., to wit 3 carucates of 240 acres each, that extent being possible by the large services owed by the tenants on some 5,000 acres on the old Manor of Adulfsnasa, of which Waleton was a portion, with Thorpe, Horlock and Kirkby. To the writer on ancient Agriculture it is perhaps all one whether a plough goes 60 acres or 240 in the year (or at best accounted for by lighter and heavier soils);\* not so however in actual practice, nor yet in records, if read with care and discretion.

Manor of Adulfsnasa.

There appears formerly to have been considerable variation in agricultural measures, and it is probable that a change in the quasi-standard quarter occurred *t.* Hen. III., in which reign it seems to have had 8 bushels, each weighing (for wheat) *c.* 64 lbs. Troy, such pound containing 7,680 wheat grains† “taken in the midst of the ear.” This

Mediaeval measures of agriculture.

\* The comparative rainfall has a much greater influence under this head, as by the number of days in a year in which land can be worked. Rainfall.

† *Vide* Statutes cited as 51 Hen. III.; 31 Ed. I.; and 1. Hen. VII.

lb. W. Chaffers\* states to have been used by the Saxons, and known as the Cologne pound; whether or not there was a qr. of wheat in England composed as above prior to Hen. III. I may not pretend to discern, but certain it is that *t.* Hen. II. and John, a quasi-standard quarter existed which was of  $\frac{1}{2}$  (or less than  $\frac{1}{2}$ ) the dimensions of that under notice. Two writers on agriculture (see *Walt. de Henley*, ed. R. H. S., and the more valuable anonymous *Husbandry* incorporated in same vol.), both perhaps *t.* Hen. III. evidently use the larger qr. [*vide* feeding rations and seed sown in vol., *ut sup.*]; and a like one occurs in the Rules of Robert Grostete (who died *t.* Hen. III.) as appears from the statement that 180 loaves (white and brown *together*), each weighing 5 *marcs* (25,600 grains), are made from a quarter of wheat in his *Household*; at this present an average qr. of Wheat, Barley, and Oats may be taken at 500, 440, and 336 lbs. (avoirdupois, 7000 wheat grains each) respectively; this modern pound presumed to be somewhat *heavier* than the older one of 64 to the bushel. That the quarter from † 7680 wheat grains was not *t.* Hen. II. and John the quasi-standard one appears from divers entries on the *Misæ Roll* (14 John), as to the travels of the King's cart horses, which are each allowed 1 bushel ‡

\* *Hall Marks on Plate.*

† *Id est*,  $7680 \times 64 \times 8$  wheat grains per qr.

‡ It is, of course, not intended to convey that either 62 or 31 modern lbs. of corn was consumed *per* horse; in 1261-1270, the larger qr. seems to have sold (for oats) at 2s.: there is no particular occasion to suppose an overstrained morality either on the part of King John's grooms, or on that of the servants of the *hostels*.

of oats (price 10d. to 1s. per qr., and in some cases provably of 8 bush.); this smaller measure would appear [*vide* entries *Rot. Pip.* 17, 19 and 20 *Hen. II.*, where quarters are named] to have been somewhat an equivalent of the contemporary *horse-load*, always bearing in mind that the burden of a *sumpter* cannot be precisely equated with a measure of capacity, owing to the differences in weight of Wheat, Barley, and Oats (*ut sup.*). Taking the qr. of *Hen. III.* onwards as being of like capacity with the present (an assumption), its contents would have had rather less actual weight (the smaller grains being relatively lighter), and the other *much* smaller quarter of *Hen. II.*—*John* would more or less be the actual load of a horse, which is the “standard” measure in the *Pipe Rolls* of the former reign. The allowance of a *destrier* *t. Ed. I.* (*Wardrobe A/cs*), is  $\frac{1}{2}$  bush. of oats (of course with sufficient hay), but a war horse it must be noted might have to carry a considerable weight of iron armour (up to 361 modern lbs.,\* cited for a *barded* horse, 1560, in Scott’s *Brit. Army*); for a cart horse (*W. A/cs*)  $\frac{1}{4}$  bush., which bearing in mind that beans were not supplied, and that the bushel was probably somewhat light (as by modern weight) is not inconsistent with present practice; the *professed* antiquary, however, should note that 1 bush. of corn per horse (14 *John*, *ut sup.*) in the measure of A.D. 1900, is just as inapplicable as the *120 acre plough theory*, merely proving the unlikeness of the quasi-standard (*t. John*) to our own. *Walt. de Henley*’s allowance of  $\frac{1}{6}$  bush. (*t. Hen. III.*, hence rather short of modern weight) of corn with

---

\* This includes the rider.

hay and chaff only, would be a defective winter ration for an average modern farm horse ; but, the anonymous writer on Husbandry (in same vol.) appears to give an intelligent record of the practice of his own district : his information can be extended, in matters like the gestation of animals, the terms in that item being nearly agreeable with modern averages. There must of course have been many ancient local variations of measure, not coincident with the quasi-standard : *horse loads* and *bushels* were used as measures *t. Hen. I.* [*Pipe Roll* and *Chron. Pet.*], and a *modius* in 1086 (*D. B.*), apparently of considerable capacity [*t. Hen. I. app. Chron. Pet.*] : the rendering of the term *seedlip* (1124, *A. S. Chron.*), as *bushel* in the note on p. 149 must not be taken as evidence of the *then* existence of a measure so called of like capacity with a modern  $\frac{1}{8}$  of a qr., but it seems to demonstrate there was in 1124 an antecessor of the modern *bush.*, by whatever name called, of like dimensions—the curious *achersetum* (presumably seed, for one acre), of the Peterboro' Inquisition (1125-8) may also be noted.

(16)







**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET**

---

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY**

---

